PRESENTED

BY THE

Bishop White Parish Library Association

of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

To The Rev. L. D. Gottschall

Date 1930

Bc

BX 5098 .B75 1925
**Brilioth, Yngve, 1891-1959.**
The Anglican revival, studies in the Oxford movement

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/bwb_C0-ALI-651

# THE ANGLICAN REVIVAL

# THE ANGLICAN REVIVAL

## STUDIES IN THE OXFORD MOVEMENT

BY THE

REV. YNGVE BRILIOTH, D.Phil.

LECTURER IN CHURCH HISTORY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF UPPSALA

WITH A PREFACE BY THE RIGHT REV.

THE LORD BISHOP OF GLOUCESTER

LONGMANS, GREEN AND CO.

39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C. 4

NEW YORK, TORONTO

BOMBAY, CALCUTTA AND MADRAS

1925

5098
.B75
1925

*Made in Great Britain. All rights reserved.*

# PREFACE

## By The BISHOP OF GLOUCESTER

When my friend, Dr. Yngve Brilioth, asked me to write a Preface to his work on the Oxford Movement, it gave me great pleasure to be able to accede to his request, not only for the sake of assisting him personally, if I could, but also because I have always taken the greatest interest in the Oxford Movement. It was one of the schemes which I set before myself many years ago to write a history of religious thought in Oxford in the nineteenth century. Like many other dreams, that has vanished away, and is never likely now to be accomplished. But I am glad of this opportunity both to say something in praise of a very admirable book and also something about the Oxford Movement.

First as to Dr. Brilioth's work. It has for Englishmen an unusual interest because it is a judgment on the great religious movement of our country by a foreigner. It has the further interest of being a study on a great movement of Institutional Religion by a Lutheran, for in many ways the Lutheran temperament and tradition represent something very different. I think all those who remember this will feel, how remarkable are the fairness and the justness which Dr. Brilioth displays. But this book has further claims still on our attention, for it is obviously the result of much research. Dr. Brilioth's estimate of the various antecedents which may have contributed to the genesis of the Movement is full and complete, and his analysis of the conditions in Oxford of that day most valuable. Perhaps there are one or two points he has passed over.

A curriculum of Oxford at that time would have seemed to many a narrow one, but there was one work which was read then of the greatest importance, and that was the 'Ethics' of Aristotle. There was a strong ethical element in the teaching

of the Early Tractarians, and there can be no doubt that the minds of most of the leading Oxford men at that time were strongly influenced by the study of Aristotelian ethics. It had, I think, probably a further influence. It is really a work inductive in its methods, and its influence may have been felt in the formation of Newman's later philosophy. A second point to remember about the Oxford of that day was the almost complete absence of scientific teaching or the scientific spirit. The education was mainly, almost entirely, literary. A wider education would not have done much to alter the Movement in some directions, but it would have enabled the theologians of the time to write their theology in a way which would have appealed more to the people of the present generation.

When we come to the narrative of the Oxford Movement itself, what strikes one as remarkable is the infinite trouble that Dr. Brilioth has taken to master the detailed history: in fact if there was any criticism to offer it would be that there was too great a mass of detail, and that it sometimes prevented one from seeing the lines of development quite clearly. He has an advantage in writing from outside; he has an advantage in writing after many others have written; and certainly it seemed to me that I was able to get a clearer idea of the course of the Movement from his account than I had yet obtained.

The genesis and cause of the Oxford Movement will always demand and deserve careful study, for it was undoubtedly the greatest Movement of religious thought of the nineteenth century, not only in England but elsewhere; and its influence has been by no means limited to this country, nor has it yet ceased. It might be almost said that there are many countries which are now just beginning to feel the effects of its influence.

It was in the first place, as all great religious movements must be, an attempt to restore religion, an attempt to make religious influence once more supreme in life. For the men who started it religion was the supreme interest in their lives, and they found themselves opposed to a world that was thinking of many other things. It was then a Movement of religious piety, and I think in its essence a religious piety of a special kind. It was, of course, not untouched by the influence of

Evangelicalism, which came to it from Newman, but fundamentally it was not Evangelical. It rather sprang from that unostentatious form of Christian piety which has always had its home in the English country village. It was the piety of Bishop Andrewes and of George Herbert. It grew up in the little villages of the Cotswolds where the Keble family held their cures. It was academic, as befitted Fellows of Oxford Colleges; it was simple and quiet, as befitted Eastleach, or Fairford, or Coln Saint Aldwyn. The piety of the Oxford Movement has never perhaps made a wide popular appeal, its influence would always be limited to the cultivated class. It has never stirred the great mass of the people of England. In its origin it represented religion combined with a simple and perhaps rather austere culture.

If we pass to the particular form which the Movement took, it was quite obviously in its fundamental characteristics a revival of Institutional religion. The Baron Von Hügel has divided religious activities into three types, the Institutional, the Emotional, and the Intellectual. The first point about the Oxford Movement was that in a world which was largely not religious at all, but if it was religious cared little for the external form of religion, it boldly asserted the voice of the Church, the religion of Sacraments, external worship, organisation, and all those embodiments of the religious spirit which people had begun to look upon almost with contempt. It is related how, early in the nineteenth century, a distinguished Judge was being shown round St. Paul's Cathedral by the Bishop of London of his day. At the end of his tour he asked his guide: 'Now can you tell me honestly whether you think a building like this does any good?' The Bishop is reported to have replied: 'Well, to speak quite candidly, I think it is of no value at all to the country.' Since then the revival of cathedrals has been one marked feature of the Oxford Movement, and few people would ask that question or give that answer nowadays. The Church gradually learnt the value of external aids to religion, beauty of worship, music, after a little time ritual and ceremonial, architecture, painting. All was assimilated by this new Movement of thought, which for England, and many countries outside England, has done much to transform the religious life.

But I do not think we should judge the Oxford Movement correctly if we limited it to the revival of Institutional religion. It was eminently an intellectual movement. Its first leaders were amongst the most distinguished scholars of the University. As we have said, there were certain narrow elements in their training, but they were all men of great intellectual ability, and they were concerned very much with the problem of finding an adequate and satisfactory basis for their religious faith. It was clear that the old Evangelical attitude had little foundation. When once people had begun to doubt the Bible, a theology which assumed the verbal inspiration of that book and had never thought of proving it would not satisfy intellectual demands; and then there was an intellectual turning away from the shallow and ostentatious rationalism of the time. Liberalism was to Newman anathema. Personally there are few elements in his creed with which I sympathise more. It claimed to know everything; while really it was attempting to limit human experience by a narrow intellectualism; and Newman in particular, but others also were searching round for a strong basis on which they could oppose this narrow, arid creed. They sought it in the authority of the Church, but that never really completely satisfied Newman. He passed from Anglicanism to Rome in the hopes of getting a stronger authority in Rome, but the study of his later life makes it quite clear that the Roman position also did not satisfy him, and so we have the 'Grammar of Assent' and the attempt to find a wider basis for religious truth. He passes from a deductive to an inductive system of reasoning, and the attempt of the modern pragmatist to build up religious truth on an inductive basis is more or less the direct result of his philosophy.

What were the permanent contributions of the Movement to religious thought? I think that the most widespread has been the revival of the idea of the Church. How widespread that is, may be seen at the present day by the desire for Christian reunion through all the religious bodies, and in almost every country. The Lutheran, the Presbyterian, the Wesleyan are asserting at the present day all the ecclesiastical side of their tradition in a way which their grandfathers could not have understood. The individualism in religion

which made any corporate reunion appear quite unnecessary has everywhere passed away, and although we may find it difficult to agree upon the definition of a Church, or to find a means of uniting the scattered elements of Christianity, yet it is because of the new impetus to corporate Christianity which the Oxford Movement first started that we are all at any rate desiring to do this.

I need not dwell on the minor influences which resulted from the Oxford Movement: art, music, and so on. It coincided no doubt with romantic tendencies which were partly fostered by it, partly created. But there can be no doubt that the religious movement in England, and to a certain extent abroad, has had a marked effect on certain artistic and literary developments. More important has been the appeal to history, gradually leading to the idea of development, and harmonising, therefore, with the contemporary doctrine of evolution. The Oxford Movement was first of all an appeal to history. It started with the assumption that history might give something static, but very soon it began to appear that this idea of a static religious authority existed only in imagination. Christian thought had changed as the times had progressed, and so Newman formulated the idea of religious development: an idea which has been taken up and had a wide influence in some of the developments of Continental Catholicism, an idea which has made it far easier to adapt Christian theology and tradition to the thought of the time. Another result of the Oxford Movement was to make religion interesting to a person of intellectual taste. How limited was the appeal of the old-fashioned Evangelicalism! but the young man swept into the vortex of the Oxford Movement found himself involved in problems of art, and history, and music. Theology once more began to claim its rightful place as a mother of the sciences, and it is that that has enabled the High Church party in England to be the leaders in the reconciliation of religion and science, religion and philosophy, and religion and criticism.

It has been asserted recently that Anglo-Catholicism cannot make terms with modern thought. There could be no more unjust or untrue statement, and it is a striking illustration of the narrow and unintelligent basis of English modernism. Dr. Brilioth quotes somewhere a statement

of Canon Storr in which he says that the religious mind is indifferent to truth. That again is a most unjust judgment. Truth may be sought in various ways. The religious mind is as keen for truth as the mind of science, but it is not every mind that can see truth from every side, and it is no more just to say that the religious man who is indifferent to scientific truth is careless about truth than that the scientific man who is indifferent to religious truth is careless. There will always be many minds that are narrow in their outlook: there are just as many in the scientific world as in the religious. But as a matter of fact it is those who have inherited the traditions of the Oxford Movement who have done more than any other body of men to reconcile religion with science, criticism and modern thought. The writers of *Lux Mundi* are the most conspicuous instance.

In what did the weakness of the Oxford Movement lie? Of course in its early days there was much crude thought and many crude ideas. New realms of religious life and thought were being discovered and explored, and often the knowledge was imperfect and the deductions inadequate. That will always be the case. I do not think that it is there that the weakness of the Movement lies; I think it lies and always has lain in its failure in its popular appeal. It has always been academic, appealing rather to the cultivated than to the great body of people; and at the present day it has very little hold on the great mass of the English people. They have learnt some things from it. It has changed the outlook and stimulated the life of the Anglican Community. It has enabled it to adapt itself to its new conditions as a cosmopolitan representative of Christianity; but it has never been able to take hold of the mass of the people as Wesleyanism or Evangelicalism did in their time, and the English Church will not be able to fulfil its task unless it adds the religion of emotion and experience to the religion of Institutions and of the intellectual life.

A. C. Gloucestr:

The Palace, Gloucester.
*September* 12, 1924.

# AUTHOR'S PREFACE

THESE studies were written for the most part during four successive visits to Oxford, 1919–1922. They were originally intended only for a Swedish public and were printed in the Swedish Year-book of Church History, *Kyrkohistorisk Årsskrift*, in three instalments in the issues of 1921, 1922, 1923. My thanks are due to the editor of *Kyrkohistorisk Årsskrift*, Professor E. Linderholm of Uppsala, for the generous hospitality of this learned publication.

Partly through the suggestions of English friends, the plan arose of attempting the issue of an English translation. The kindness of Messrs. Longmans & Co., and the unsparing energy of an eminently qualified translator have made this possible. That the Bishop of Gloucester should have been willing to introduce my book to the English public by writing a Preface was indeed more than I could have hoped. I must ask his lordship to accept my humble and sincere thanks for the great kindness he has shown me in this, as in many other ways.

That it must seem presumptuous in a foreign student to attempt an historical treatment of one of the most important chapters in modern English Church history, I am well aware. Yet I should like to plead in excuse two things: first, that a foreigner, perhaps, may have opportunities of impartial judgment which do not easily present themselves to English students, especially in connection with a movement which is still so much of a practical issue, and in so high a degree the object of love and of antagonism. And secondly, that I do not know of any work in the extensive literature of the Oxford Movement which has done just what I have attempted to do: *i.e.* to treat it as a chapter of Church history, where—under the influence of local, personal and temporary factors—elements derived from very different sources have produced a most interesting religious and ecclesiastical phenomenon, which must be taken on its own merits and carefully analysed.

In order to avoid as far as possible all disturbing influences from later controversies it has seemed appropriate to limit the analysis to what might be called the formative or seminal period of neo-Anglicanism, the Oxford Movement proper. I do not imagine, of course, that I have said the last word on this Movement. If I may claim to have stated some problems, and given some indications of their solution which may at least serve as starting-points for future discussion, I shall not consider my effort to have been in vain.

It remains for me to express my sincere gratitude to all those who have furthered my work, and have shown kindness to me in various ways during my visits to England. The unmerited friendliness which has fallen to my lot—a friendliness displayed by men belonging to various schools of thought, both within and outside of the Church of England—has made these visits exceedingly rich in memories. They are good to look back upon, and make it difficult for me to consider myself an entire stranger on the soil of *Ecclesia Anglicana*. It is my earnest desire to do all in my power, little as it may be, to further a better understanding between that Church and my own ; and I hope that this book, at least, may not impede the task.

The Bishop of Durham, I trust, will allow me to express my gratitude for the kind hospitality extended to me both in Hereford and at Auckland Castle—much as he will disapprove of many statements in this volume. Baron von Hügel may by now hardly remember the young heretic whom he entertained at Egham during some days in August 1919 ; but his visitor will never forget the walks in Windsor Park, nor the impression he received of a truly catholic mind. In Oxford I have had the privilege of doing most of my work in the Pusey House, with the free use of its library. I was also allowed to live in the House for two months in 1920. For this I cannot sufficiently thank the Principal and Chapter of that institution. To the Principal of Ripon Hall I am indebted for hospitality enjoyed during the summer of 1922 ; Westcott House, Cambridge, received me with great friendliness for two weeks in the spring of the same year. I owe much to the kindness of the present Dean of Canterbury, the Very Rev. G. K. A. Bell, whose name I shall always associate

with my visits to Lambeth and Canterbury. To Dr. Watson, of Christ Church, I must express my sense of obligation for the benefit which I have derived from his lectures, as well as from personal intercourse. Of my other English friends, I must here mention two only: the Rev. A. E. J. Rawlinson, B.D., of Christ Church, who encouraged me to produce my book in English, and introduced me to my present publisher; and the Rev. G. H. Fendick, M.A., formerly of Pusey House, now of All Saints', Clifton, who has done more than anyone else to make me feel, in the Church of England, a real spiritual kinship, and to open my eyes to something of the best in the essence of neo-Anglican religion. That neither he, nor anyone else except myself, is responsible for the opinions expressed in this book, I need hardly point out.

YNGVE BRILIOTH.

# CONTENTS


| CHAPTER | | PAGE |
|---|---|---|
| I. | Introduction | 1 |
| II. | The High Church Tradition | 16 |
| III. | Evangelicalism | 29 |
| IV. | The Forerunners of Neo-Anglicanism | 45 |
| V. | The Romantic Movement and Neo-Anglicanism | 56 |
| VI. | The Noetics—The Problem of the Establishment | 77 |
| VII. | The Fulness of Time | 93 |
| VIII. | Scena—Dramatis Personae | 103 |
| IX. | The First Attack and the Golden Age of Via Media | 127 |
| X. | The Crisis | 146 |
| XI. | The Static View of the Church | 180 |
| XII. | The Fundamental Forms of Tractarian Piety | 211 |
| XIII. | The Progressive Idea of the Church | 260 |
| XIV. | The Doctrine of Justification | 274 |
| XV. | Mysticism and Sacramentalism | 295 |
| | Appendix I. | 331 |
| | Appendix II. | 334 |
| | Index | 343 |

# THE ANGLICAN REVIVAL

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

THE separation of the English Church from Rome in the sixteenth century is rather a phase of the nationalist movement of breaking away from the undivided Latin Church, which began in the last centuries of the Middle Ages, than part of the great continental Church Reformation.[1] The English reformed Church is in the first place national. Just as in the Middle Ages *Ecclesia Anglicana* embraced all Christians within the ecclesiastical provinces of the realm, so it was the aim of the Tudor State Church to do the same. Anglican and English were still in the history of religion identical in meaning. They were not long so to remain. The Anglican Church, as it was built up under Elizabeth, was a notable attempt to throw the dome of the National Church over Christians of a very different way of thinking. It endeavoured to embrace both Catholics, in the wider sense of the word, and Protestants. But the Protestantism which was thus comprehended was of another type than the continental and in comparison with it thin and negative. The Reformation proper in England in the sixteenth century had been strongly influenced by Humanism. Though Lutheran influence was not absent in its earlier stages, yet it was to the early Fathers that both Cranmer and Ridley appealed in the last instance,[2] and it was by the standard of the primitive

[1] Cp. Lindsay, *A History of the Reformation*, vol. ii. (2nd ed., Edinburgh, 1908), pp. 315 f.

[2] Hunt, *Religious Thought in England from the Reformation to the last Century*, vol. i. (London, 1870), pp. 20, 27.

Church that they designed to cut off the excrescences of Roman doctrine and cult. The English Reformation did not depend on any new spiritual awakening, and there was little experience of the violent religious crisis of the Continent, and the values which were its result.

But when the Church under Elizabeth was built up on this ground-plan, already a far stronger wave of Protestant and predominantly Calvinistic influence had reached England, by way of Frankfurt and Zürich. It left its mark even on the recognised fathers of the new Anglicanism, especially Jewel; but first and foremost it produced a reaction against the comprehensive policy of a State Church and its tolerance in the question of continuance of ecclesiastical usages.

Thus the path of Anglicanism had already begun to narrow, it had no longer the confidence of the whole country, when it produced the work, which on the basis of profound thought was to give the classic foundation of this wide vision of old Anglicanism. It was precisely as a defence against the radical and one-sided criticism from the Calvinistic party within the Church, the party whose members were still only nicknamed Puritans, that Hooker wrote his famous work, 'Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity.' The first four books came out in 1594, and the fifth followed in 1597. Books VI and VIII were posthumously published in 1648, VII did not appear till 1662; they were all edited, and VI is probably by another hand.[1] Through this work the English Reformed Church, which had arisen in compromise, attains for the first time the dignity of a Church organisation with a type of its own, going its way without slavish submission to Rome, Geneva, or Wittenberg.[2] We cannot follow Hooker's reasoning through the mighty tomes that his work fills. The explanation of the relation of God's eternal laws to the mutable and wide-spreading laws of time lifted the controversy on to the highest level of which contemporary thought was capable, and placed

[1] Henson, *Studies in English Religion in the Seventeenth Century*, p. 137; article 'Hooker' in *Dictionary of National Biography*; Holmquist, *Engelsk högkyrka, lågkyrka, frikyrka* (Uppsala, 1916), p. 67.

[2] 'No man in the Church of England speaks with greater weight than the judicious Hooker—If Jewel is the Apologist of the Reformation, Hooker is the Apologist of the Church of England.'—H. M. Gwatkin, *Church and State in England to the Death of Queen Anne* (London, 1917), p. 263.

its author in the foremost rank of his country's thinkers. And when he descends from the heights of speculation to the valleys of daily controversy he never loses sight of the high ground, and his defence of the ordinances of his Church in cult, doctrine, and constitution shows a liberal width of vision which his modern successors have only too seldom reached.[1] This is not least true of his reassertion of the Episcopal form of government. He was more strongly conscious than others of the fathers of the Anglican Reformation, except Jewel, of the great experiences of the Church during his own century ; he refuses to disinherit his Church from the treasures of the Reformation any more than from those of the early Church. Could a *Via Media* have been effected, as Hooker traces it out, the English Church might have been constructed in a more lofty and enlightened form than any other. Here Catholic and Protestant meet in a genuine union, and the national basis is laid deep and broad. The national State and the national Church are identical ; this is the fundamental principle in the posthumous eighth book, and it is also a solution of the problem of Church and State quite in the spirit of the Reformation age ; just as Israel alone among the kingdoms of old had the truth of religion and therefore also was a Church of God, so Jesus Christ's Church is ' every such politic society of men, as doth in religion hold that truth which is proper to Christianity. As a politic society of men it doth maintain religion ; as a Church, that religion which God hath revealed by Jesus Christ.'[2] And it is one of the perversions of the truth, with which he reproaches his Puritan opponents, that they separated State and Church as two corporations independent of each other.

Hooker's work marks the end of the only period in the history of the nation, when the realisation of this high ideal of a Christian state, whose other name is Church, seemed still possible. The history of the following centuries shows us only, how gradually it is destroyed. At times we find later schools of thought claiming descent from him, but at the

[1] For a conspectus of Hooker's first five books see Paget, *An Introduction to the Fifth Book of Hooker's Treatise of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity* (Oxford, 1899). The chief editions are Keble's (Oxford, 1836–8) and the revision of it by Church and Paget (Oxford, 1888).

[2] *Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, bk. viii. ch. 1, § 2.

same time doing nothing but fit detached fragments of Hooker's building into a system which rests on a narrower basis. The seventeenth century bore witness how the thought of old Anglicanism was wrecked. After Hooker came Laud, after Elizabeth, James I and Charles I. Divine Right took the place of the constitutional rule to whose hands Hooker entrusted the direction of the Church. Byzantium instead of Jerusalem became the model. Moreover, the Catholic principle appeared in a more one-sided form than previously. The symbolic language of ceremonies and historic associations came to the front. The name of Protestant was certainly not repudiated : it followed both Laud and his king to the scaffold. But all the same, it was a Protestantism which consisted rather in the negation of Rome than in the appropriation of the new orientation of religion produced by the Reformation. And at the same time, the flood of Reformation had seriously reached England, but now it had to carve out a way for itself alongside of the Anglican main current. The path of the Anglican Church had finally begun to narrow long before the germs of religious unrest in strange combination with constitutional problems brought about the catastrophe. When the Restoration replaced the Episcopal Church in its old home, the time for a comprehensive policy was past and gone. The Act of Uniformity became the wall which permanently fenced off the Anglican Church from natural and fruitful relations with the Reformed Churches. Its national character gave a wrong idea of what it was, since it left great hosts of most serious religious people outside its limits. If by the Test Act full civic rights were reserved to communicants at its Altar, this served rather to profane the Sacrament than to extend the principles of the National Church. Thus the Restoration Church shows us a narrower Anglicanism than that of Hooker, or even of Laud. But at the same time, we see more plainly than before how with the progressive religious differentiation there emerged from the crucible of time a definite type of Anglican piety. Its characteristic feature is humanistic theology, with ever stronger leaning to the Church of the Greek Fathers, an ascetic ideal of holiness, which produced types of fine spirituality akin to the saints of the Middle Ages, and alongside of it a vein of mystical

religion. This direction of piety, which forms the most definite contribution of Anglicanism to the gallery of religious types in Christendom, is of decidedly Catholic temper. It can be traced through the century with increasing plainness, from Andrewes to Ken and Wilson.[1]

When we speak of the contemporary Anglican Renaissance, we apply the term in this emphatic meaning. The profound remodelling, which the English Church underwent in the nineteenth century, is doubtless a highly composite product. It is precisely the task of the present work to disentangle the different factors which contributed to bring it about. Foreign elements are not wanting, and movements which went on without regarding national frontiers, made their contribution. But the movement, at least in the beginning, is in its essence Anglican. The most essential feature in its character is precisely that it brought to more extensive predominance within its Church the Anglicanism in the narrower sense, which takes its conception of the Church from Laud and its piety from the Fathers of the Restoration. In so doing, it has as little as any other similar effort succeeded in reproducing the past. It has itself unconsciously borrowed much from the very schools against which it directed its attack, and precisely in this way perhaps won much of its special religious value. It has its greatest interest from the fact that it was conducted from the first by men of such strong and original endowment that it was impossible for them colourlessly to reproduce the impressions they received. Finally, foreign influences have directly and in increasing measure influenced the Anglican Renaissance—the historian who ventures the attempt to follow its course into our own day must find his most delicate task in seeking where the Anglican ends, and where the pure Latin begins.[2]

In the history of the Anglican Renaissance no episode

[1] Ken himself in his will thus characterised his theological and ecclesiastical position : ' I die in the Holy Catholic and Apostolic faith, professed by the whole Church before the division of East and West ; more particularly I die in the communion of the Church of England as it stands distinguished from all papal and puritan innovations, and as it adheres to the doctrine of the Cross.'

[2] Inge (*Outspoken Essays*, London, 1919, p. 31) sees in the extreme High Church of to-day a purely Latin movement.

can compare in interest with the Oxford Movement. But it is important to make clear that this is not identical with the revival of Anglicanism in general, or the rise of a new Anglicanism, which is a more comprehensive process. But its leading principles have nowhere been more clearly grasped, nowhere received a more plastic, and scarcely a more one-sided development, than in the religious and literary movement which so violently disturbed the University city on the Isis during the memorable years 1833–45. This must therefore always be the natural centre of a study of the Anglican Renaissance. Its presuppositions in the period immediately preceding and its historic roots are the subject to be treated in the next following pages.[1]

Every great movement, like every great personality, has an inclination to put its neighbours in the shade, and concentrate all attention on itself. It can easily cast its shadow behind itself on the pages of history. A period, which was not worse than many others, is often unjustly criticised through the proximity of a time of uplifting and of heightened life. In a special degree was this the case with the first third of the nineteenth century in the history of the English Church. Declamations about the dark time before 1833 are numerous, not least among the historians of the Oxford Movement.

After having described the dangers which threatened the Church from the Liberal propaganda and the contemporary religious currents, W. Palmer[2] continues: ' We had a weak

[1] From the terminological point of view it seems most fitting to use the expression Oxford Movement in the same sense in which it was applied, *e.g.*, in Church's classic work, *The Oxford Movement—Twelve Years—1833–1845*; that is to say, of the time which is bounded on one side by Keble's sermon on *National Apostasy* and the first of the *Tracts for the Times*, on the other by Newman's secession to Rome in 1845. On the other hand, it seems less appropriate with Ollard in his *Short History of the Oxford Movement* to include the ritualistic movement as well. The terminology used in this book answers most closely to that of Thureau-Dangin in his well-known work *La Renaissance catholique en Angleterre au XIX^e siècle*, only that I substitute Anglican for Catholic. Yet I want to emphasise also that the Anglicanism which was revived by this movement was not only a ' revival ' of an older form of religion, but, to a great extent, a new creation. This I venture to express by the word ' Neo-Anglicanism.'

[2] *A Narrative of Events connected with the Publication of the Tracts for the Times* (London, 1883), pp. 28 f.

and divided Church. . . . Religion had fallen into the same state of decline, which it had often experienced in times past, when Satan had succeeded in corrupting the "salt of the earth" and rendering the "fine gold dim." . . . There was no means of offering an effectual resistance to the spreading evil of unsettlement and infidelity. The lines of religion needed to be restored and deepened. Principle had to be infused where there was none to fall back upon. It was in vain to appeal to principles which were not understood. There was no foundation, or an uncertain one, on which to build. The bishops wished well to the truth, but they were in fear of the Government and its powers for good and evil. They were cautious, and did not see their way to any action in opposition to the spirit of the times. So, generally, were the higher clergy; they were timid; they could, perhaps, see farther than men of humbler station and less wide views. Doubtless the bishops and dignified clergy, in the presence of royalty and of the chiefs of the State, did their best, but they did not possess the attributes of boldness of speech and action which afterwards characterised some of their number.'

Against this dark background is outlined how it pleased God to call from the lower clergy His chosen instruments for the renewal of His Church. As in the sixteenth century a humble Augustinian did God's work, so it was in the eighteenth when 'three obscure men[1] were raised up in Oxford to awaken a nation. . . . And so in our own days God hath visited His people and out of Sion called to them and summoned them to be ready, with their loins girded and their lights burning. . . . He can make any instruments, however humble, do His work. . . . It was the effectual purpose of the Lord to revive His own chosen Church. . . . He permitted the souls of believers to be sorely oppressed and wellnigh driven to despair, before He sent relief to their sufferings.' They could say with the prophet that they saw how Israel's children threw down the Altar of God. But the answer was 'Yet have I left me seven thousand in Israel, who have not bowed the knee to Baal.' 'And thus might those who were impelled to come forth on the Lord's side in

[1] The two Wesleys and Whitefield.

1833 know that, notwithstanding the indifference or hostility of the world, there was a remnant left, which had not shared in the spirit of the age.'

This is the true Tractarian conception. Modified by a high personal culture and scientific training, it can be traced even in R. W. Church, the classic historian of the Oxford Movement. He describes also how the attack of the Liberal Movement found the Church defenceless : 'The idea of the clerical life had certainly sunk both in fact and in the popular estimate of it. The disproportion between the purposes for which the Church with its Ministry was founded and the actual tone of feeling among those responsible for its service had become too great. Men were afraid of principles ; the one thing they most shrank from was the suspicion of enthusiasm.'[1] Since then under the influence of inferior spirits a vulgate has gradually been formed in the High Anglican writing of history as regards the representation of the time before 1833. This I find for example in typical form in a book by G. Kelway, 'The Story of the Catholic Revival' (second edition, London, 1915). In literature of this kind there are numerous descriptions of priestly indifference : the Squarson, a compound of Squire and Parson, who lived his comfortable life as an honest landed proprietor, took a lively part in the neighbourhood's more or less robust pleasures, hunted, ate and drank, at the best the worldly-wise indispensable adviser of his flock, now that the tradition of a century had reconciled him to the Hanoverian dynasty, and there was no longer a king on the other side of the water who had a legal claim on his heart and on his toasts. Sunday came as a slight interruption in the agreeable round of days. His well-worn dialogue with the 'Amen-clerk' was soon finished, and a spell of moralising from the pulpit or a serious warning against the dangerous seducers, who would lead religion out of the little cosy brain-cell, which was once for all open to his disposition, into the wide regions of the life of feeling and will—this cannot either have cost very much trouble. Certainly the Squarson was not guilty of the error of appealing to the emotional possibilities, which perhaps still lurked in his hearers, by any care whatever for the out-

[1] *The Oxford Movement* (London, 1891), pp. 2 f.

ward forms of divine service. And the state of the Church fabric answered to the nature of the service. Often enough green mould crept over leaning walls.

As was said, the descriptions are numerous, and hard judgments have been pronounced. The question is, how far are the former representative and the latter justified. The Squarson was probably at this time only a relic of the golden age of practical materialism and Walpole's days, before enthusiasm broke out in full flame in the 'second Oxford Movement,' that of Wesley and Whitefield. When George III's long reign drew to its close, the warmth of that movement—often enough tempered to a comfortable tepidity—had reached many a parsonage in the Established Church. Clerical types more or less answering to the Squarson can never have been quite wanting in a Church which rested under the shade of the secular power. And we have no possibilities of deciding in what degree it was represented in England at the time immediately before 1830. At the same time it is worth while to take into consideration in what degree the standard which is generally set for judging the Church life at the beginning of the century was specially fitted to put it into an unfavourable light. In any case it is certain that the judgments would have been considerably more favourable if, instead of starting from the standard created directly or indirectly by the Oxford Movement with its demand for the quantitative and qualitative increase of the life of divine service, and above all its strong emphasis on its sacramental side, the continental or Scandinavian reformed Churches had been taken as material for comparison. Against the black pictures with which later literature overflows can be set a contemporary judgment of the opposite kind. Thus, for example, Southey writes in 1817 to Bishop Jebb in Limerick: 'Unless I deceive myself, the state of religion in these kingdoms is better at this time than it has been at any other since the first fervour of the Reformation. Knowledge is reviving as well as zeal, and zeal is taking the best direction.'[1] And the very same year in which the Oxford clarion began to sound, he could write that 'the Church in England and Ireland was never in a better position to stand hostile investigation than now';

[1] Quoted by Overton, *The English Church in the Nineteenth Century*, p. 8.

and we have scarcely right to question his sincerity. No doubt at this time he was one of the most faithful friends of the Anglican Church, perhaps in a higher degree than his poet-brothers Wordsworth and Coleridge. But his judgment is not therefore valueless. One could rather invert the relation and say that it is no small argument in defence of the Church of the day, that he himself, as well as the greater geniuses whom we just mentioned, the Lake Poets proper, after the revolutionary and pantheistic extravagances of his youth could find rest in the Church of his fathers, and lift high its flag in the literary controversies of the day.

However, to form an approximately impartial judgment of the condition of the Church between 1800 and 1830 we need material of a more concrete kind than subjective opinions founded on principles which were more or less foreign to the period under judgment. We can at the most conclude from them that the besetting sins of a State Church could be observed in this as at other times, and that now as usual they were in the first instance of a negative order. It must, then, in the name of justice be recognised that the more dependable and palpable material which contemporary information offers, to a certain extent, but only to a certain extent, confirms the judgment above quoted. We hear of how the liturgy could be abbreviated at will, and its ceremonial directions anarchically set aside. The place of communion in divine service must even, from other standpoints than the High Anglican, be regarded as unsatisfactory; if the capital could give an opportunity of communicating every week, in a country church the Sacrament must only have been administered four times a year.[1] The quality of the

[1] Three times a year in the eighteenth century must be regarded as a minimum. Christ Church at Oxford had a celebration once a week (J. Wickham Legg, *English Church Life from the Restoration to the Tractarian Movement* (London, 1914), pp. 34 f.). In cases where it is possible to establish the average number of communicants, the attendance seems to have been in some instances as high as one could desire. At Llanfair Caereinion, in St. Asaph diocese, out of a population of 2537, there are 750 communicants at Easter; at Llanfyllin, with 400 to 500 inhabitants, the number at Easter rose to 200 to 300. When in 1800 the number of communicants in Lincoln diocese was counted the clergy were disappointed with the result that only one-sixth of the total communicated: in 1911–12 the number at Easter reached one-eighth; the corresponding proportion for England as a whole was about one-tenth (Wickham Legg, *op. cit.* pp. 40 f.).

sermons was sharply criticised, not least by the Church's most devoted friends. In cathedrals, however, divine service was celebrated with dignity and rich accessories, and daily service was the rule. In other towns weekday services must have been obsolete.

All this speaks of conditions which were far from ideal, but scarcely in themselves justify too severe condemnation. But in other directions we have abuses of a more serious kind attested, abuses which might well inspire fears in the friends of the Church, and give occasion to the attack and interference of enemies. I refer partly to the Church's inability to keep pace with the vastly increased activity of material life at the time, partly to the bad organisation which has constantly been a shackle on the English Church and to this day has only been partly remedied, but at the time we are treating of was acute to a degree. The law of *inertia*, the application of which to the history of the religious community the Church historian has many opportunities of observing, was incessantly the strongest factor in the Anglican Church, though, as we soon shall see, its dominion was no longer undisputed. But now, as at other times, its effects became especially fatal at a time of expansion and restless development in other spheres of the common life.

The rise of industrialism, which at the introduction of the great Reform Bill, and long before, made the franchise so monstrously unjust, had even had the audacity to rearrange the population of dioceses and parishes. The discovery of coalmines in Llandaff diocese, previously a quiet and idyllic country-side, originated restless centres of industry, and the population was doubled and trebled.[1] A list of the year 1831 gives as the most populous diocese in the country, Chester with 1,833,958 inhabitants distributed in 616 parishes.[2] The Royal Commission, which in the thirties investigated the conditions of dioceses, recommended the foundation of a new diocese of Manchester out of Chester, while other parts were

[1] Overton, *The English Church in the Nineteenth Century*, p. 19; cp. Mathieson, *English Church Reform*, 1815–40, pp. 17 f.

[2] Newman, *The Restoration of Suffragan Bishops Recommended, etc.* (London, 1835), p. 51; reprinted in part i. of *Via Media* (Longmans, 1908), p. 70.

to be cut off and given to a new diocese of Ripon.[1] In some respects it was perhaps still more serious, that through the rapid growth of towns the old church buildings and the staff of clergy were completely inadequate. This was not least the case with the great parishes in the capital. On the average the churches of London must only have had room for one-tenth of the population of the city. To no small extent may this be ascribed to the Napoleonic Wars, which made building operations difficult. In George III's reign not more than six churches were built in London. With the restoration of peace began a period of church building. The initiative was taken by the leading High Churchmen, notably Joshua Watson and Daubeny, whose names we shall soon meet in another connection. In 1818 the Church Building Society was formed, and considerable sums had been collected by individual subscriptions. Even the State authorities were favourable: thus Parliament adopted the Church Building Act, which granted a million pounds for the object, and facilitated the formation of new parishes. Private liberality continued to flow, and church building went on, though often in unsuitable forms. Even from outsiders words of recognition of the activity of Churchmen are heard. But at the same time it was pointed out that the real defects of the age were not of such a kind that they were cured by new churches, and that the old places of worship, though theoretically insufficient, were in effect far from full. 'Churches come from religion, but religion does not come from Churches.'[2]

The early nineteenth century had inherited from earlier days two most serious defects of organisation, the unequal distribution of Church revenues, and the cumulative holding of benefices partly, though not wholly, caused thereby. They

[1] *The First and Second Report from His Majesty's Commissioners appointed to Consider the State of the Established Church with Reference to Ecclesiastical Duties and Revenues* (London, 1836), p. 17. This Commission had been appointed by Peel's Government in 1835. Its proposals with regard to the reconstitution of dioceses became law in 1836 (Cornish, *The English Church in the Nineteenth Century* (London, 1910), vol. i. p. 114). At that time the Irish Church had no fewer than 22 dioceses, though only a small part of the population belonged to the English Church. In this case the first interference of the zeal for reform from without was, one must admit, well grounded.

[2] Miss Harriet Martineau, quoted by Cornish, *op. cit.* vol. i. p. 82.

were probably not aggravated during this period, but the new demands of the age made them appear in clearer light. Thus ample material was found for unmerciful criticism, such as was expressed in 'The Black Book' (1820),[1] and 'The Extraordinary Black Book' (1831), two anonymous publications (the author's name was John Wade) which, apart from the unrestrained sallies, and some gross exaggerations which they contained, had more than enough actual material to build on: the Church revenues were enormous in their total, but were at the disposal of a few rich men, while the poor lower clergy could only with difficulty keep themselves above starvation line; even against the Bill,[2] which in 1836 attempted and partly carried out a levelling, it could be observed that it left 2000 livings of only £100 and 300 with only £50. 'The revenues of the Archbishop of Canterbury alone might offer a decent livelihood to 300 poor clergy, who now starve at 2*s*. 8*d*. a day.'[3] In cases where the revenues did not even approximately reach the minimum for subsistence, it became necessary to try and unite several benefices under one incumbent. But pluralism was not limited to this: there are many examples of prelates who did not scruple to increase in this way their already enormous incomes. Bishop Watson of Llandaff (died 1816), the object of whose desires was to be remembered as an improver of his estates, and a planter of trees, held sixteen benefices. In 1811 it was estimated that 3611 incumbents were non-residents.[4] One is led to a comparison with the state of things in the later Middle Ages: offices, which implied responsibility for the eternal welfare of human souls, were treated almost as lightly as then, as a desirable prey for covetousness and insatiableness. Nepotism flourished: a Bishop of Ely, his son and grandson together disposed of an income of £30,000 of Church property. Archbishop Manners Sutton of Canterbury presented seven relatives jointly to sixteen benefices.

But it is not only individual cases of abuse which we have here to instance. The fact is that the organisation of the

[1] Overton, *op. cit.* p. 11; Cornish, *op. cit.* p. 108.

[2] The Established Church Bill.

[3] Cornish, *op. cit.* vol. i. p. 115 (quotation of a statement in Parliament by Fowell Buxton).

[4] Mathieson, *op. cit.* p. 22.

English Church remained in all essentials in its mediaeval condition, though the king, or in various cases the Archbishop of Canterbury, took the place of the Pope. In the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, the theory and practice with regard to Church affairs were the same as in the fifteenth century. In short, everyone who got the opportunity became a pluralist, and public opinion scarcely protested at all. In the first place there was a quantity of positions of high dignity and canonries *sine cura animarum* which were combined in a few hands. This could happen without any obstacle from Church Law. Offices *cum cura*, parish churches in the first instance, were held, as in the Middle Ages, to be incompatible, that is not to be united in one hand. But dispensation from this rule could be obtained by special licences. These were issued as formerly by the Pope, so now by the Archbishop of Canterbury, and in them the mediaeval formula was still used, though translated into English. No doubt the eighteenth century had been the golden age of office hunters, bishops' favourites and relatives; but that pluralism, including the holding of several parishes, was still the case in the thirties to an extent which now seems almost incredible, appears from the report which the Ecclesiastical Commission published in 1836. To provide the churches, when the incumbent was not resident, with curates-in-charge, poorly paid and with low qualifications, was of course the rule. This could happen, since the mediaeval conception, that every priest's administration of office was essentially equivalent, and only required one qualification—namely, ordination—still survived at the beginning of the nineteenth century. The organisation of parochial work and its valuation is of comparatively recent date in England.

In respect of these conditions of organisation no doubt a radical change has taken place. But it is really not the work of Neo-Anglicanism, and certainly not of the Oxford Movement, rather it was produced by the same secular zeal for reform of which the first interference caused Newman to take up his pen and evoked Keble's declamation against 'National Apostasy.' It was the Ecclesiastical Commission of 1835 which removed the abuses of organisation that at the beginning of the century stood in the way of Church reform. By

The King's Lib


the erection of a standing body of Ecclesiastical Commissioners there came into existence also an organ for the continuation of reform. By the Church Pluralities Act of 1838 a legal limit was set to pluralism. But when such possibilities were created, it was the new spirit within the Church which made the reforms fruitful.

These allusions must suffice; for it is outside the plan of this sketch to give a full presentation of these problems, which to a certain extent have never ceased to be acute within the English Church. But we must keep in mind what has been said, to understand the violence and in some measure the justification of the attacks directed against the Church by the reforming zeal of the age, these assaults which were the external cause of new life being awakened within its old walls.

Was then the stream of life dried up within the Church, was it in a desert that the tree of the Anglican Renaissance shot up? It is natural, that accounts which were immediately caused by the impression of the great regeneration, at times should say something of the kind; and in popular imagination the dogma has become firmly rooted, that the first third of the nineteenth century was a period of spiritual deadness, representing the complete ebb in the life of the Church through the centuries. But if we look closer, there are not wanting signs that the tide of life had begun to rise, and the attentive observer will not fail to notice presages of the flood. Alongside of easily distinguishable defects the nineteenth century also took over from that which preceded yet unexhausted sources of strength. We have chiefly to notice two: the High Church tradition, which in no way always represented the spiritual lifelessness of absolute conservatism, and the Evangelical movement.

## CHAPTER II

### THE HIGH CHURCH TRADITION

How the old inclusive Anglicanism in contracted but intensive form returned to power after the Restoration of 1660 has been sketched above. The three decades which followed were in a measure the brilliant period of Laudianism. But after the glorious Revolution came a change. This partly had its cause in a natural reaction from the spirit which prevailed during the century of religious warfare—a reaction by no means limited to England. A new generation had grown up, which was tired of controversy, and was more interested in the telescope than in dogmas. A century of latitudinarianism begins in the Church of England. The victory of toleration is produced by a change of thought as well as by political considerations. That it was an advance in human history is certain. But its religious value depends in the last resort, on the question, whether the victory was due to indifferentism or to Christian love. Certainly the eighteenth-century English Church has often been unjustly blamed, and the shadow of the Oxford Movement has been thrown back far behind 1800. In many respects the eighteenth century is a great period in the history of religion in England : but in the story of Anglicanism it certainly betokens a decline. In no period since the Reformation has the typical Anglicanism been less typical of the Church of England.

One cause of this is the natural change of thought which came in with the Revolution. But that the Laudian tradition so quickly lost its influence was to a high degree due to political causes ; the change of dynasty led to schism, and those who went out because their consciences forbade them to break their oaths to the apostate son of the martyr-king

were exactly the foremost representatives of the High Anglican school, led by men like Archbishop Sancroft and Bishop Ken. These Non-Jurors[1] by their schism fatally weakened the strength of the Laudian party within the Church. Though the cause of the schism was chiefly political, it soon obtained a religious content. By fresh consecration the Non-Jurors propagated an episcopate of their own (up to 1805), and within the party were preserved the principles and Church usages which the rest of the Church abandoned, and which during the Renaissance of the nineteenth century came into honour again as constituents of the inheritance of primitive doctrine and practice which were then revived. It is in effect among Non-Jurors, like Ken, Sancroft, Dodwell, and Robert Nelson, with a circle of churchpeople who were allied with them, though they took the oath to William III, and afterwards to the Hanoverian dynasty, men like Bull and Beveridge, that we have to look for the representatives of a definite Anglican conception of the Church, and of a specific Anglican piety at the beginning of the eighteenth century.[2] With these men, as with the classic fathers of Anglicanism, we find references to the authority of the early Church as the highest standard next to the Bible. Here, as in the Neo-Anglicanism of the nineteenth century, by concentrating their interest on the Church of the fourth and fifth centuries, they were led to an over-estimate of the importance of the priestly office, and the institutional conception of the Church; and the schismatic separation of the party probably helped to underline the one-sidedness of their outlook. The preference for the first Prayer Book of Edward VI with its somewhat richer Liturgy, which was always found in Anglicans of definitely High Church type, became now one of the distinguishing marks of the Non-Jurors. It was a question in the first place of four usages: the mixed chalice in the Eucharist, prayer for the

[1] For the Non-Jurors see Lathbury, *A History of the Non-Jurors* (London, 1845), and J. H. Overton, *The Non-Jurors, their Lives, Principles, and Writings* (London, 1902); J. Wickham Legg, *English Church Life from the Restoration to the Tractarian Movement*, pp. 16–20 and *passim*.

[2] We should not, however, forget that Bishop Wilson of Sodor and Man, a type of the old Anglican tradition, survived till 1755. His *Sacra Privata* long into the nineteenth century was one of the most favourite Anglican books of devotion, and J. Keble devoted much time to work on his biography.

blessed dead, prayer for the descent of the Holy Ghost on the consecrated elements, and the offertory prayer,[1] the latter connected with that conception of the Eucharist which was one of the distinguishing features of the religion of the Non-Jurors, and which at least approximated closely to the Sacrifice of the Mass. It was also this little group, separate as it was, which in its generation preserved the thought of the unity of the Universal Church, and the word Catholic had for them the same fascinating sound which it had for their heirs in the nineteenth century. But unlike these, they were not afraid of the name Protestant. And though political sympathy with Roman-Catholic Jacobites in some measure softened the bitterness of religious antagonism, and a man like Robert Nelson was on friendly terms with Bossuet, yet Non-Jurors were far from thinking of any union with Rome. On the other hand they sought connections with the Eastern Church in Russia and Greece, which then, as later, to Anglican eyes appeared in an idealised light.[2]

From among the Non-Jurors came one of the most important personalities in the religious history of England, William Law (1686–1761).[3] This highly cultured High Churchman, with the elegant style, which could rival the best of the contemporary literary world, became—not least through acquaintance with the German mystics of the Middle Ages, and with the writings of Jakob Böhme—the most pronounced mystic in England. A mystic-Neoplatonic conception of the nothingness of the material life, of the body as

[1] Overton, *The Non-Jurors*, pp. 292 ff. Not all Non-Jurors approved of these practices : in effect, the question of these four ' Usages ' produced one of the schisms in the party which were further to weaken its influence.

[2] Peter the Great's visit to England had created interest in the Russian Church. At the end of the seventeenth and the beginning of the eighteenth centuries the English Universities were visited by Greek students. When in 1716 Arsenius, Metropolitan of Thebais, visited London, the leading Non-Jurors made serious efforts for approximation. This gave rise to an interesting correspondence (see Lathbury, pp. 309–361), but led, of course, to no practical result.

[3] J. H. Overton, *William Law, Non-Juror and Mystic* (London, 1881) ; C. J. Abbey and J. H. Overton, *The English Church in the Eighteenth Century* (new ed., London, 1887), pp. 253–263 ; Inge, *Christian Mysticism* (4th ed., London, 1918), pp. 278–286. Law belonged to the group of Non-Jurors who refused to take the oath to the new dynasty, and therefore had to resign his fellowship at Cambridge, but continued in communion with the Church of England.

the grave of the soul, and of the task of Christianity 'to separate us from nature, to free us from slavery to our own nature, and to unite us with God,' is the background of his ethical preaching in 'Christian Perfection,' and in his most famous book, 'A Serious Call to a Devout and Holy Life.' This work, the literary perfection of which, especially in the portraits of different types of character which it contains, was testified to by both Gibbon and Samuel Johnson, is rightly regarded as one of the finest pearls in English religious literature. In spite of the gloomily ascetic view of life which it portrays, by the seriousness of its moral warnings, it has been a powerful and rousing sermon. One of those who received the strongest impression from it was John Wesley, and this is not the only link that connects the High Church mystic with the Methodist Movement.[1] The latter, in effect, forms one of the channels by which Law's influence was carried on, an influence which has never ceased to affect serious minds within Anglo-Saxon Christianity. Not least was this the case with the Neo-Anglican Movement.[2] Already in Law there is the same element that gave the Tractarian conception its specific quality, though in this case characteristically combined with a richer vein of mystic piety than we meet anywhere later in the religious history of England.

A fuller exposition of the extent to which the Oxford Movement was directly indebted to the Non-Jurors, and is to be regarded as a continuation of their theological tendency, would be out of place here. Here we have only to point out that, though the Non-Jurors stood for principles which are quite near to those of Neo-Anglicanism, the result was that the Church of the eighteenth century as a whole came to be more removed from these principles than it would have been had they not been maintained by men who were suspected because of their Jacobite connections. And the unpopularity which fell on them because of this unlucky

[1] Bishop Warburton wrote in his *Doctrine of Grace* that it was Law who was the parent of Methodism, and Count Zinzendorf who rocked the cradle (quoted by Abbey, *op. cit.* p. 266); and the Methodists themselves looked on him as a forerunner.

[2] It is well known how Keble, when Hurrell Froude said *A Serious Call* was a clever book, replied that this expression seemed to him about as fitting as speaking of the Last Judgment as 'a pretty sight.'

political alliance, extended to the High Anglican position in its entirety.[1]

The eighteenth century—so far one can accept the view of Neo-Anglicanism—was the period of Erastianism, in so far as this name implies the conception which so strongly emphasises the connection of Church and State, that it entirely loses sight of the Church's supernatural and spiritual reality, and sees in it little more than a department of state. The bishops and dignitaries of the century were politicians rather than Churchmen. There was nothing in this disturbing to the thought of the age; the mediaeval idea of the bishop as one of the great men of the realm, whose chief task was to advise the king, and whose presence was more necessary at Court than in the diocese, continued in large measure; only the place of the king had been taken by the chameleon-like majesty of Parliamentary government, and the bishop's obligation was no longer to give a manly and independent counsel, but in place of that to work in Parliament and the diocese for the Minister to whom he owed his elevation. With a hierarchy so composed—and even in the first third of the nineteenth century it was so composed—of course bold thoughts of the high spiritual value of the Church and its ministry, and their independence of the secular power, were bound to be rare. But such a hierarchy was no exponent of the feeling of the clergy. On the contrary, the conflict between Whig bishops, who had Walpole or one of his successors of the same party to thank for their elevation, and the leaders among the dignitaries and clergy, who were mostly Tories, was one of the chief causes of the Church's inefficiency. So far one must adopt the Neo-Anglican view of the eighteenth-century Church. This antagonism was directly the cause of the suppression by the Government in 1717 of the Convocations, the ancient Church Synods of the provinces of Canterbury and York.

But at the same time this reservation must be added, that the judgment on the Church becomes erroneous when it is extended to apply to the theological science of the century: for the work which it performed in the presen-

[1] Abbey and Overton, *The English Church in the Eighteenth Century* (London, 1887), p. 12.

tation of problems which, though more naively conceived, had a great kinship with those of our own day, is certainly a more important chapter in the history of theological thought than the attempt of Tractarianism to go back to the ecclesiastical science of the seventeenth century.[1]

It was the controversy between Deism and Orthodoxy which produced the most important work of theological and religious literature in the century, alongside of Law's 'Serious Call,' Bishop Butler's 'Analogy' (1736).[2] His thoughts on the parallel which prevails between Revelation and Natural Religion, of different degrees of probability as decisive for the winning of a conviction, and of its ethical verification in conscience, have given his work a rare apologetic value, and the work has become a factor of permanent importance in England's religious thought. Here we can only allude to the part which Newman ascribes to Butler in his own development.[3]

But the position, which at the beginning of the century had its typical representatives in the Non-Jurors, did not die out with them. Though it lacked literary representatives, it was carried on in private; and at the beginning of the nineteenth century seems again to be growing stronger, though it is marked by a certain aridity, and though, so long as it remains in its isolation, it does not seem noticeably to affect its contemporaries. When we speak of High Churchmanship at the beginning of the nineteenth century the term is ambiguous. Contemporary traditional usage applied it to the conservative followers of existing church practice, especially the Church's quality of State Church. The clergy and laymen, who revered the Church as an element in 'our happy constitution,' and the Prayer Book as an Act of Parliament, were certainly not few. In this context we mean by High Church rather those who ascribed to the Church a divine origin, and an existence independent of the good pleasure of the secular society, and generally speaking in religion and in theology were the successors of Caroline Anglicanism. The latter had certainly been,

[1] It was Mark Pattison who, in his essay 'Tendencies of Religious Thought in England, 1688–1750,' in *Essays and Reviews* (1860), after the Oxford Movement first attempted to do justice to eighteenth-century theology.

[2] For Butler see W. A. Spooner, *Bishop Butler* ('Leaders of Religion'; London, 1901).

[3] *Apologia pro vita sua*, p. 10 (ed. 1908).

in its way, strongly in favour of a State Church, but nevertheless the consequences of its theological thought were under new circumstances to lead to a demand for the freedom of the Church in nineteenth-century High Anglicanism.

In a collection of memories, printed in 1868, by an author whose pseudonym describes him as 'an hereditary High Churchman,'[1] we find it vigorously maintained that 'Church principles,' as the term goes, existed even before 1833. The torch of Andrewes and Ken had not entirely gone out, and the thoughts of the Caroline Age had not died out with Jacobitism; 'Catholic traditions,' actually as good as any which were preached, after the Oxford Movement had done its work, had been cherished as valuable inheritances in Anglican families. But a neglected ritual and slack Church discipline prevented them from coming to their own. From his father, who was a clergyman, the author had had it deeply rooted in him that his own Church taught the Real Presence in the Eucharist as much as the Church of Rome, though with avoidance of its mistake in trying to define the incomprehensible. From him he had also received the thought that the Church of England was Catholic without insisting on denying Rome's right to the same title, and the doctrine of Apostolic Succession. His father's Church had also been carefully attended to and richly adorned, and the services had been performed with dignity and rich musical equipment. The author's mother came of a Non-juring and Jacobite family, and had influenced her son in the same direction, just as she introduced him to the world of the Waverley Novels, which in him, as in so many of his contemporaries, awakened the longing for the renewal of the richer ritual of past days. On his own account he taught himself, with the help of Martindale's 'Calendar of the English Church' (1831), to observe Saints' Days. So when 'Tracts for the Times' began to come out, he found in them little more than a confirmation of what he regarded as his spiritual heritage.

The description is valuable as showing how High Anglican principles lived on in private, and how they contributed to

[1] *Reminiscences of Forty Years, by an Hereditary High Churchman* (reprint from the *Ecclesiastic*), London, 1868. The author's name was James Hicks Smith.

pave the way for the coming restoration. It is also well known how Keble declared of the principles of the Oxford Movement: 'It seems to me to be the same as what my father always taught me.' [1] When the century began the High Church School had again got an important literary expression in Archdeacon Daubeny's 'Guide to the Church' (1798).[2] He starts from the dictum 'quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus creditum est' in Vincent of Lérins' 'Commonitorium,' [3] words which could be taken as a motto for the history of Neo-Anglicanism, and which before the Oxford men scarcely found any more pugnacious or more one-sided exponent than Daubeny. He maintains the doctrine of Apostolic Succession with all desirable emphasis. The Apostolic commission is derived from the Head of the Church, and it can be proved, it is said,[4] that this same commission was to follow the Church at every step of its advance. Therein lies also the basis of the authority of the Church; if, as the author maintains, this commission was carried on to the Church of his own time, all ecclesiastical authority must be derived therefrom. On this rests also the validity of the administration of the Sacraments. The importance of the episcopate as bearer of the Church's commission is motived in almost exactly the same way, as we shall later find in 'Tracts for the Times.' It was to the Apostles that the Saviour gave His commission in Matt. 28. 18 ff. 'In fact there was no other difference between the Apostles and bishops but this: the Apostles are recognised as the first sowers of the Gospel, were general and ambulatory bishops, having the care and superintendency of all the Churches (2 Cor. 11. 28), but bishops were Apostles fixed to the jurisdiction of one city or one province.' [5] And the witness of Scripture is completed

[1] E. Wood, *John Keble* ('Leaders of the Church'), p. 2.

[2] The second edition (London, 1804) is quoted.

[3] 'In ipsa item catholica ecclesia magnopere curandum est, ut id teneamus, quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus creditum est.' For this canon and its importance in Church history, since from Tertullian to Bossuet it was used in controversy with all kinds of heresy, see ch. iii. of the introduction to Moxon's edition ('Cambridge Patristic Texts,' 1915).

[4] P. 35.

[5] *Appendix to the Guide to the Church*, pp. 63 f. This is in full agreement with the Tractarian theory, which even its modern defenders admit nowadays to be scientifically untenable.

and confirmed by the utterances of the oldest Fathers of the Church. Ignatius and others of the immediate successors of the Apostles declared as with one voice, 'that the bishops were the successors of the Apostles, and the episcopal office the ordinance of God.' Thus what we shall later on study as the static Neo-Anglican conception of the Church, at the very beginning of the century was maintained with an energy, of which the intensity was scarcely surpassed afterwards. Daubeny certainly does not entirely reject the epithet Protestant for his Church, but interprets the Protestantism of the English Church as consisting in 'the right which one independent branch of the Church of Christ claims of protesting, in its collective character, against the errors of another branch of it, with which, from local circumstances, it may, or may not, hold communion.'[1]

Along with Daubeny mention should be made of Bishop Van Mildert as one who theoretically maintained the special character of the Anglican Church in the High Church sense. In his Bampton Lectures, delivered at Oxford in 1814,[2] he gives a moderate but definite expression to the Anglican conception of tradition and the general sense of the Church as a complement to Scripture, and a rule for its interpretation. 'While our Church is thus careful not to set up her authority as an unerring standard of truth, she omits not to testify her deference for the judgment of the Church Catholic, when it can be duly obtained. She everywhere shows her readiness to abide by that judgment, and to reverence it in proportion to the evidence of its antiquity and uninterrupted continuance. She assumes to herself no more than to be regarded as a true branch of the Universal Church, not denying that Churches may err, nor asserting any claim of infallibility, either for herself or others.'[3] As to the Sacrament Van Mildert, like Daubeny, maintains that the doctrine of the Real Presence in the Eucharist, 'spiritually, mystically, and sacramentally understood,' can be derived from the formulae of the Anglican Church.[4] He

[1] *Guide to the Church*, p. 150. Daubeny's *Guide* provoked replies from the Calvinistic side, which he answered in *Vindiciae Ecclesiae Anglicanae*.

[2] W. Van Mildert, *An Inquiry into the General Principles of Scripture-Interpretation* (Bampton Lectures; Oxford, 1815).

[3] *Ibid.* p. 279.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 284.

does not seem to be conscious of any dualism between the Articles and the Liturgy, and his conception of the Church is the same as Daubeny's. Van Mildert also bases the authority of the Church and the position of the episcopate on the doctrine of Apostolic Succession.

No doubt theoretical formulations as clearly conceived as these are quite isolated, but it must be remembered that we meet the same view with even greater clearness in Bishop Jebb, though his special position makes it necessary to treat of him in another context. Among the bishops, too, were found not a few who plainly attached themselves to the position which was advocated by Daubeny and Van Mildert.[1] But the High Church way of thinking had its most influential centre outside the circle of prelates. What Clapham was to the Evangelicals, Clapton was to the High Churchmen. The expression, the 'Clapton sect,' was even used, and it denoted Joshua Watson and his friends. Clapton was Watson's home for a great part of his life: he died there in advanced age in 1855. Himself a business man in the earlier part of his life, he was in close connection with prelates of Van Mildert's type, and united with a strict High Church attitude, which led him largely to sympathise with the Non-Jurors, an unwearying activity for the good of the Church, particularly as treasurer of the S.P.C.K. and the Church Building Society.[2] He hailed with satisfaction the presage of the Anglican Renaissance, and the earlier stage of the Oxford Movement; Newman dedicated to him the fifth series of his 'Parochial Sermons,' though he himself described this as an 'unsanctioned offering.' Newman's later development filled Watson with horror. Pusey could with greater justification see in him a forerunner. With reference to a personal meeting he wrote once to Watson: 'I cannot say how cheering it was to be recognised by you as

[1] As early as 1790 Bishop Horsley of St. David's (later of Rochester, died 1806) had ventured firmly to maintain the Church to be an independent society: 'He who thinks of God's servants as the servants of the State, simply stands outside the Church, separated from it by a sort of self-excommunication' (quoted in Overton, *The English Church in the Nineteenth Century*, p. 26). Bishop Marsh of Peterborough, who lived till 1839, was a typical High Churchman, and Bishop Lloyd of Oxford can also be mentioned.

[2] For Watson see E. Churton, *Memoir of Joshua Watson* (Oxford and London, 1861), 2 vols.; and Overton, *op. cit.* pp. 28 f.

carrying on the same torch which we had received from yourself, and those of your generation who had remained faithful to the old teaching. We seemed no longer separated by a chasm from the old times and the old paths to which we wished to lead people back: the links which united us to those of old seemed to be restored.'[1] Watson's closest clerical friend was his brother-in-law, H. H. Norris, who rivalled himself in importance—from Norris' parish of Hackney, the school was sometimes called 'the Hackney phalanx'—and Thomas Sikes of Guilsborough (died 1834), especially famous for the prophetic words, in which he seems to foretell coming events: 'Wherever I go all about the country, I see among the clergy a number of very amiable and estimable men, many of them much in earnest, and wishing to do good. But I have observed one universal want in their teaching: the uniform suppression of one great truth. There is no account given anywhere, so far as I see, of the one Holy Catholic Church. . . . The doctrine is of the last importance; and the principles it involves of immense power; and some day, not far distant, it will judicially have its reprisals. . . . And woe betide those, whoever they are, who shall, in the course of Providence, have to bring it forward. They will be endlessly misunderstood and misinterpreted. There will be one great outcry of Popery from one end of the land to the other.' One cannot wonder that Pusey in 1842 saw in this the difficulties of his own time prophesied.[2] To the names quoted could easily be added others, both of the same generation—like Christopher Wordsworth, the brother of the poet, who in Cambridge was the opposite pole to the evangelical circle that gathered round Simeon—and of the next following.

[1] Churton, *op. cit.* vol. ii. p. 82.

[2] Sikes is said to have let fall this remark in the beginning of 1833, thus before any of the *Tracts for the Times* had appeared. It is quoted by Pusey, *A Letter to His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury on Some Circumstances connected with the Present Crisis in the Church of England* (4th ed., Oxford, 1842), pp. 27 f. Some pamphlets by Sikes exist, entitled *Dialogues between a Minister of the Church and his Parishioner*, which are typical of the intolerant attitude of Highchurchmanship to Evangelicalism; *e.g.* it is said of Wesley's 'disgusting journals' that they are 'books that are stuffed with more profane and shocking things . . . than I saw in the worst of infidel books,' etc. And these dialogues were circulated by S.P.C.K.! (Gladstone, *Gleanings of Past Years*, 1843–79, vol. vii. pp. 216 ff.).

Here we must dwell awhile on a man who is usually, though probably without justification, reckoned as one of the leaders of Neo-Anglicanism, but should rather be regarded as in his age best representing the old High Churchmanship, Hugh James Rose of Cambridge (1795–1838).[1] In his 'Apologia'[2] Newman has paid a sincere tribute to his memory. 'To name his name,' says he, 'is to awaken in all who knew him, a number of agreeable and warm recollections. He was the man, who above all others was suited by his talent and literary ability to take a stand, if it ever could be taken, against the evils of the age. He was gifted with a high-minded conception and breadth of view, and a real sensibility for all that was great and beautiful; he wrote with warmth and energy; he had a cool head and a cautious judgment. He exhausted his strength and shortened his life *Pro Ecclesia Dei*, as he conceived this sovereign idea.' But Newman goes on to show why Rose and the Oxford men were bound to go their several ways in spite of alliance. Rose was conservative before all things, and, owing to the position he early acquired in his University, more bound by considerations than the light guard of Oriel. Rose filled the post of 'Christian Advocate' at Cambridge, a kind of readership in Apologetics, later converted into a chair, and exercised a stirring influence as preacher. As early as 1825, he had from the pulpit of the University Church delivered a series of lectures on 'The State of the Protestant Religion in Germany,' the result of a tour in that country the previous year. The aim was definitely apologetic, and scarcely in the best sense. On the basis of incomplete knowledge a terrifying picture was drawn of the ravages of rationalism in the Evangelical Churches of Germany as a warning and correction to those who felt themselves tempted by the Sirens of Liberalism. The book witnesses in a deplorable degree to the author's inability to comprehend new thoughts and to his want of critical training. It produced a far more important reply from Pusey, who at this time was suspected of liberal tendencies: 'Historical Inquiry into

[1] 'H. J. Rose, the Restorer of the Old Paths,' in Burgon's *Lives of Twelve Good Men* (new ed., London, 1891). Cp. A. C. Headlam, 'H. J. Rose and the Oxford Movement,' in the *Church Quarterly Review*, 1921.

[2] P. 104.

the probable Causes of the Rationalist Character lately predominant in the Theology of Germany,' 1828,[1] one of the most thorough works on German theology which has seen the light in England. Though Pusey is not able any more than Rose rightly to estimate the work done by contemporary theological science in Germany, his view is juster, and characterised by more breadth than Rose's. How the controversy was continued in new editions of both books it would be out of place here to relate.

On the whole H. J. Rose gives the impression of being one of those men whose early developed receptivity awakens hopes which afterwards are scarcely realised. He certainly used his talent to the uttermost, but he lacked the spark of creative genius; and so the highest title of honour that can be given him is that of 'Restorer of the old paths.' But this gives him certainly a place of honour in the history of the Anglican Renaissance alongside of the Tractarian brotherhood. They were the advanced guard: he was the doughty defender. And, on the other hand, by his less fanciful temperament he was protected from the extreme one-sidedness of the Oxford men. The highest service Rose rendered to the new movement was the foundation of a magazine, which was to form a rallying-point for the 'friends of the Church.' The *British Magazine* began to appear in 1832, and soon became the chief literary organ of the Oxford men. Rose's Rectory at Hadleigh was the scene of a memorable meeting in 1833, one of the events which initiated the Oxford Movement properly so called.

[1] For this and the polemic which followed see Liddon, *Life of Pusey*, vol. i. pp. 151 f.

## CHAPTER III

### EVANGELICALISM

OXFORD has started three movements of religious reformation. The first is bound up with the name of Wycliffe, the second with that of Wesley, the third with that of Newman. At times it has been said that the Evangelical awakening, of which what we have called the second Oxford Movement formed the first phase, was a renewal of the subjective side of religion, an expression of the renaissance of individualism which one has been accustomed to ascribe to the nineteenth century,[1] and also a reaction of feeling against the dry rationalistic religion which prevailed within the Church. Probably it is true that the fire of enthusiasm denounced as heretical flamed up higher than at any other point in the history of Anglo-Saxon religion, but of all movements which have ended in revolt against traditional Church systems none has shown a greater power of creating stable and organised forms for the new life which it brought forth—forms for which it was anxious to find precedents in Church history, although at times, in order to contain the swell of feeling, they had to go back to the freer organisation of the early Church as they pictured it to themselves. But when John Wesley, in defence of his innovations in liturgy and Church discipline, quoted the example of the early Church, this is one feature among many which shows his genuine Anglican temper.[2] His High Church up-bringing to some extent stamped his whole life.

In the very first stage of the movement, during the Oxford

[1] Cp. Carlyle, *Englands Kyrka och Kristenhetens enhet* (Uppsala, 1919), p. 50.

[2] Abbey and Overton, *The English Church in the Eighteenth Century*, pp. 230 f.; D. Baines Griffith, *Wesley the Anglican* (London, 1919), pp. 93 f.

period of Methodism, the Anglican stamp was very prominent. In another context we have pointed to some of the connecting links between this early Methodism and the definite High Churchmen of the time, especially among the Non-Jurors. The members of the Holy Club in many respects anticipated the High Church movement which a hundred years later was to proceed from the same place. They attached much weight to the Sacrament, particularly to frequent communion (in Oxford every week; more regular opportunity was not afforded), and saw in the Eucharist a sacrifice of objective character. They were also alternatively called Sacramentarians.[1] Wesley himself held the doctrine of Apostolic Succession. Even the Methodists of the next generation preserved a profound attachment to their mother Church, esteemed highly Liturgy and Sacrament, and the habit of visiting the parish church every Sunday and Holy Day only slowly died out.[2]

Thus the early Evangelicalism concealed the seed of a Church renewal of far more comprehensive kind than that which was carried out by the Methodist body, or by the branch of the movement which remained within the Church. Wesley's legacy was never fully used up by his direct successors. It was in some measure his spirit which was so to fertilise the organism of old High Churchmanship that it once more could bear offspring.

It was the impression derived from Luther's preface to the Epistle to the Romans that called forth the decisive crisis of Wesley's life.[3] It was well prepared: to this influences from the Moravian brotherhood had contributed. Impressions from fellow-travellers on the way to Georgia in 1735 had been strengthened after arrival there by intercourse with Spangenberg.[4] The crisis took time to ripen: it took place at Herrnhut.[5] This is typical of the movement

[1] Townsend, Workman, and Eayrs, *A New History of Methodism* (London, 1909), vol. i. p. 145; *John Wesley's Journal* (ed. N. Curnock; London, 1909), vol. i. pp. 95–98.

[2] Townsend, *op. cit.* vol. i. pp. 387 f.

[3] *Wesley's Journal*, vol. i. p. 475.

[4] *Op. cit.* pp. 110, 143 f., 152 f.; Townsend, vol. i. pp. 191 f.: for Luther's influence on Wesley see pp. 200 f.

[5] *Wesley's Journal*, vol. ii. pp. 19–57; Southey, *Life of Wesley*, pp. 84 f., 91 f., 103 f.

which takes its origin from Wesley. Through Evangelicalism there was once more a linking up of the connections between England and the Reformed Churches of the Continent, connections which had once contributed to condition the course of the Anglican Reformation, but after the Restoration of 1660 had almost entirely ceased. Wesley and the branch of Methodism which followed him felt most strongly the influence of the Lutheran tradition: in Whitefield's branch Calvinistic influence predominated. The distinction between the two Methodist branches was compared about 1800[1] by one of the most original of British theologians not merely to the two chief directions which the Reformation took, but to the opposite poles of the early Church, Chrysostom and Augustine.

The influence of the Continental reformed Churches is especially perceptible in the Evangelical movement *within* the Church. As was stated above, this continued the best traditions of the English Reformation. Perhaps this may in its measure contribute to explain how the Anglican Renaissance of the nineteenth century, which in theory from the first was in the sharpest antagonism to the Evangelical party in the Church, came to set aside so completely this part of the Church's inheritance. In order to understand the bias of the Oxford leaders in their estimate of the Reformation it is necessary to remember that they judged it to a great extent from the impressions they had received of it in Evangelicalism, which was only a very one-sided expression of its true spirit, partly perverted by a strong dose of eighteenth-century Individualism. Moreover, it was to a great extent the Calvinistic party among the Evangelicals who stayed in the Church. Part of the Calvinists, it is true, followed Whitefield, but it was chiefly Evangelicalism with a Lutheran or Arminian complexion that took its own road in Methodism. This however, if true, requires modification. Evangelicalism within the Church was certainly not altogether withdrawn from Lutheran influence, which in time made itself more strongly felt. The lines of demarcation between Lutheran and Calvinist have never really been satisfactorily drawn in the history of English Protestantism.

[1] A. Knox, *Remains*, vol. iii. pp. 103 f. (' Letter to Mrs. Hannah More on the Design of Providence respecting the Christian Church ').

Here we must at least make a cursory acquaintance with Evangelicalism in the Church at the two points in which it may be said to have influenced the development of Neo-Anglicanism. Of the Evangelicals of what might be called the older school we will only dwell on the men to whom Newman in his autobiography ascribes a decisive influence on his development. Again the Evangelicalism of the earlier nineteenth century supplied the surroundings in which several of the Oxford leaders were brought up and to which they afterwards took up a strongly antagonistic attitude without fully realising their debt to this school.

It was the Calvinistic side of Evangelicalism that influenced Newman. It was Calvinistic influence, particularly through one of his teachers at school at Ealing, Walter Mayers, that in 1816 brought about in the 15-year-old boy the religious crisis which he never ceased to regard as a real conversion, and as decisive for the whole of his life.[1] And he himself stresses the importance of the fact that it was a definite dogmatic system that affected him. It was Mayers who put into his hands Calvinistic books. The first name he mentions in 'Apologia' is Romaine. A work by him was one of the first books he read. He adds that he does not remember the title or the contents, but one doctrine was indelibly fixed on his memory, that of the final perseverance of the elect. William Romaine (1714–95) represents the thorough Calvinistic school of Evangelicalism. His spirit was most closely related to the Puritans of the old stock, and his writings, like the man himself, have a severely archaic stamp.[2] Perhaps it was his 'Life, Walk and Triumph of Faith'[3] which Newman read. Within the Evangelistic movement he represents the opposite pole to Wesley, though the theological opposition did not lead to a breach of personal relations.

Romaine's extreme Calvinism was regarded as giving support to Antinomianism by his greatest contemporary among the Evangelicals of the Church, John Newton (1725–1807), the former slave-dealer, who could point to his own life

[1] *Apologia*, p. 58 (ed. 1908, p. 4); *Letters and Correspondence*, vol. i. pp. 22 f., 27 (ed. 1903, pp. 17 f., 24).

[2] Abbey and Overton, *op. cit.* pp. 372 f.

[3] There were, strictly, three separate pamphlets—*The Life of Faith* (1763), *The Walk of Faith* (1771), and *The Triumph of Faith* (1795).

as the most powerful sermon on the power of the Gospel to reform a man.[1] Greater as spiritual adviser than as preacher, Newton acquired a powerful influence over men who were to lift Evangelicalism to a higher plane: William Cowper (1731–1800) became its poet, ranking with the highest literary geniuses, and Thomas Scott (1747–1821) its interpreter. In his 'Force of Truth' the latter described his religious evolution from Unitarianism by way of Arminian tenets to a moderate Calvinism after the manner of Newton. During his early undergraduate years Newman thought of visiting Scott's parsonage at Aston Sandford, and he regards him as the 'writer who made a deeper impression on my mind than any other, and to whom (humanly speaking) I almost owe my soul.'[2] He speaks with admiration of his bold unworldliness and vigorous independence of mind. He followed truth wherever it led him, beginning with Unitarianism and ending in a zealous faith in the Holy Trinity. 'It was he who first planted deep in my mind that fundamental Truth of Religion.' With the aid of Scott's 'Essays' and a book by Jones of Nayland, one of the few eighteenth-century links in the chain which unites the old and the new Anglicanism, he put together Scriptural proofs of the doctrine before he was sixteen. Dogma had already taken the leading place in his mind, which it never left. The young Newman for years used two sentences out of Scott's writings almost as proverbs: 'Holiness rather than peace,' and 'Growth the only evidence of life.'

Some remarks on Calvinism and Catholicism, which may be quoted, are added in the 'Apologia.'[3] 'Calvinists make a sharp separation between the elect and the world; there is much in this that is cognate or parallel to the Catholic doctrine; but they go on to say, as I understand them, very differently from Catholicism—that the converted and the unconverted can be discriminated by man, that the justified are conscious of the date of their justification, and that the regenerate cannot fall away. Catholics, on the other hand, shade and soften the awful antagonism between good and

[1] Abbey and Overton, *op. cit.* p. 378; J. Stephen, *Essays in Ecclesiastical Biography* (London, 1883), pp. 401–415.

[2] *Apologia*, p. 60 (1908, p. 5).

[3] P. 61 (1908, p. 6).

evil, which is one of their dogmas, by holding that there are different degrees of justification, that there is a great difference in point of gravity between sin and sin' and deny the possibility of assurance of salvation. The only Calvinistic doctrine which had a permanent influence on Newman was the contrast of 'heaven and hell, divine favour and divine wrath, the justified and the unjustified.' Perhaps one is not far wrong if in the Calvinistic influences of his youth one traces the reason of the dark shadow which always rested on Newman's preaching, and made many a visitor to the old spiritual adviser at the Birmingham Oratory come away depressed. 'Newman was always a Calvinist,' said one of those who thus visited him, a man who afterwards earned a great name in his Church, and he added that he missed in him the 'sign of joy' which Benedict XIV regarded as indispensable in any real Catholic Saint.

It has no small interest, in the light of youthful impressions, to seek explanations of utterances of riper years. While still Anglican in 1837, Newman gives utterance to his dislike of Wesley. That has personal motives: Wesley has not only an 'exceeding self-confidence' but a 'black self-will, a bitterness in his religious passion, which is very unamiable'[1] When he says of Whitefield 'he seems far better,' one may ask whether to some extent the Calvinist was not more acceptable, and whether the personal antipathy to Wesley is not based upon theological antagonism. But even Wesley was to the Anglo-Catholic less disgusting than Continental reformers. If one had to choose, one would have more reason to say—'Sit anima mea cum Wesleio' than 'cum Luthero,' or 'cum Calvino et cum multis aliis.'[2] So we read in an essay on 'Selina, Countess of Huntingdon' (1840), an interesting witness to Newman's high estimate of Methodism, which, however heretical, is recognised as having produced hidden treasures out of the Church's treasure-house.

Thomas Scott's long life unites the Evangelicalism of the eighteenth century with that of the early nineteenth. One of his contemporaries, who did not live to see the new century, but also forms the transition to the later centres of Evan-

[1] *Letters and Correspondence*, vol. ii. p. 224 (ed. 1903, p. 200).
[2] Newman, *Essays Critical and Historical*, vol. i. p. 388.

gelicalism within the Church is Joseph Milner (1744–97), the historian of Evangelicalism. With him this Calvinistic colouring seems to have disappeared and Lutheran influence to have been predominant. Milner's 'History of the Church of Christ'[1] aimed at giving a history of the Christian Religion, not of doctrinal controversies. The point of view from which he arranges his subjects is the doctrine of justification by faith alone, apparently in a purely Lutheran form, as the sign and seal of true Christianity. He proposes to show how it was the open or concealed source of strength to the Fathers of the Church and the Saints in all ages. He did not succeed in carrying his own presentation of the subject beyond the thirteenth century. In the history of the early Church the emphasis falls, as is natural, on St. Augustine. It was the long extracts from the Fathers in Milner's work which specially roused Newman's interest;[2] its leading ideas seem to have passed by him without leaving any trace behind. In any case it seems as if Newman had completely escaped Lutheran influence, and all the more easily, as he never knew Luther's language. Ignorance of German has had in the past and still has a great share in England's isolation from the religious and theological development of the Continent.[3] Milner's 'Church History' must be one of the most important monuments we possess of Lutheran influence on English ground.[4] Isaac Milner (1750–1820), the brother of the historian, was his literary executor. To the three parts which Joseph Milner published, Isaac added two more, completed on the basis of his brother's collections.[5] In these parts, which include the Reformation, the Lutheran character comes out far more strongly. The exposition is concentrated round

[1] J. Milner issued three parts: I, 1794; II, 1795; III, 1797. See also Stephen, *Essays in Ecclesiastical Biography*, pp. 436–442.

[2] *Apologia*, p. 62 (ed. 1908, p. 7).

[3] *Cf.* Inge, *Outspoken Essays*, pp. 183 f.

[4] One of the deepest thinkers of Anglicanism, already quoted, Alexander Knox, in a letter *On Justification* (1810), took Milner's *Church History* and its doctrine of Justification as a typical example of forensic justification against which he maintains a moral, and finds that easier to exemplify in the Fathers. Milner's work is, he says, full of complaints of the obscurity and complication that prevailed on this point in the early Fathers (Knox, *Remains*, vol. i. pp. 256–288).

[5] Part IV appeared 1803; Part V, 1809; new edition of all five parts, 1810. The latter has been used above.

Luther, and the preface speaks the plainest language. Here the defects in earlier English histories in the description of the reformer are lamented. People have not quoted the actual documents, and have concentrated their interest on detailed criticism of the Catholic system, in which Luther was often anticipated by Erasmus. Instead, Joseph Milner, according to his brother,[1] saw the finger of God in every step of the Reformation. He was quite at one with his favourite Luther that 'the real disease of the Church at the beginning of the sixteenth century was the corruption of Evangelical doctrine.'

I have dwelt somewhat fully on Milner's 'Church History' because it seems to me to indicate a turning-point in Evangelicalism from a period of predominantly Calvinistic colouring to one of more Lutheran type. Probably there was often scarcely any consciousness of any contrast between the two main diverging lines of the Reformation. J. Milner says, 'It is well known, that Luther's doctrines are on the whole accepted by every branch of the Protestant Reformation.'[2] The austerity of strict Calvinism had already been filed away, so that a new spirit could prevail and hardly be noticed. With Isaac Milner, whom we shall soon meet again in his proper surroundings, we have thus entered on the Evangelical period of the early nineteenth century, and thus been led into surroundings which are very unlike those in which Newton formed a central point. Evangelicalism had perhaps lost its first freshness, but doubtless it was at this time the strongest force within the Church, or rather the only force in the Church which could in any measure work aggressively; for High Churchmen thought of scarcely anything else than stubbornly defending their position once for all taken up. One can speak of an Evangelical party, but it had no sharp limits. Rather was it that all who strove for a warmer religious feeling, all who were really spiritually minded, to put it differently, came to be counted that way even if they had little sympathy with the theoretical principles which marked Evangelicalism in the narrower sense. The time of persecution was past, and the party was not without powerful protectors. Such were among the bishops: Porteus, of

[1] Preface to Part IV, p. 8.

[2] Preface to Part V, p. 7.

London (*d.* 1808), Shute Barrington of Durham (*d.* 1826), the brothers Sumner, one of whom ended as Archbishop of Canterbury (1848–62). But it was outside the hierarchy that the party had its fortresses proper. The chief of them were Clapham and Cambridge.

Clapham, now swallowed up in London, was then a country village near the capital, where some like-minded friends, among others the rich London bankers, Thornton, Zachary Macaulay, father of the historian, and most famous of them all, William Wilberforce, found a comfortable retreat after the day's labours in the City or Westminster. It was the *Edinburgh Review* which invented the name 'The Clapham Sect.'[1] There cannot be any doubt of these men's religious convictions. John Venn, parson of Clapham, round whose pulpit they collected, is one of the more attractive clerical figures in the history of Evangelicalism, though he does not occupy the same central place as his father, Henry Venn, author of 'The Complete Duty of Man.' The Claphamites united a sincere and active piety with a refined culture, which did not hesitate to surround itself with all the comfort that riches could give. One cannot wonder that those who stood without the circle thought the narrow way, as it was walked in Clapham, very comfortable; its fleshpots, according to Thackeray, rivalled the Egyptian. But with all this, these men subjected themselves to a detailed self-control, and used their time and worldly goods as a talent entrusted to them. And Clapham became a central point for practical efforts in the service of man and the Church, which formed the most honourable page in the history of Evangelicalism. We need only to point out the tough and finally victorious fight against the slave-trade, which made Wilberforce's[2] name immortal. Most of the societies for religious objects which saw the light at this time and form the most abiding legacy of Evangelicalism to later times, were founded and led from

[1] Balleine, *History of the Evangelical Party* (new ed., London, 1911), p. 99; cp. Stephen, *Essays* ('The Clapham Sect').

[2] It may deserve to be pointed out that Wilberforce belonged to those who stood quite far aloof from the doctrinal Evangelicalism with its strongly Calvinistic colour, and in many respects were nearer to a High Church view (Overton, *Church of England in the Nineteenth Century*, p. 68). Wilberforce's *Practical View of the Prevailing Religious System* (1797) was the most widely circulated book in the Evangelical literature of the time. It was a layman's book, in which practical questions were preferred to doctrine.

Clapham, or had some connection with the Venn-Wilberforce circle. When in 1799 the Church Missionary Society was founded, as the Church's first effective organ of missions to the heathen—the century-old Society for the Propagation of the Gospel could not keep pace with the new spirit of missionary enterprise—it was with Venn as President and Thornton as Treasurer. Lord Teignmouth, also reckoned a Claphamite, was (1804) the first President of the British and Foreign Bible Society, and Wilberforce and Thornton belonged from the first to its managing committee.[1] From Clapham also was started the journal, *Christian Observer*, in which the Evangelicals found an organ which could venture and with honour maintain hot brushes with the redoubtable *Edinburgh Review*. Round Clapham the other leading personalities of the party grouped themselves. When Miss Hannah More left the 'world' in which she shone as a learned and lettered lady, the friend of Dr. Johnson, Reynolds, and Garrick—two of her plays had been performed with success at Covent Garden—she entered into close connection with the Wilberforce-Macaulay circle, and the correspondence and intercourse in the Clapham society were ennobled by her taste and intelligence, no longer devoted to the sinful enjoyment of the theatre.[2] A life-long friendship united Wilberforce with the above-named Isaac Milner, President of Queens' College, Cambridge, the pride and tyrant of the University, and at the same time Dean of Carlisle. Thus the spiritual friends in Clapham might be invigorated by visits from this 'Dr. Johnson of Evangelicalism,' the strongest personality of the party in his time, a massive soul in a no less massive body; and his bonhomie and brilliant conversation made every party at which he was present at least animated.[3]

'The Dean' introduces us to the learned headquarters of the party in Cambridge. Here Charles Simeon (1759–1836)[4] exercised a perhaps less noisy, but certainly more profound, influence than Milner. It is true of him, as of several of the most noted representatives of the school, that their first strong

[1] Balleine, *op. cit.* pp. 106, 111 f.

[2] Abbey and Overton, *op. cit.* vol. ii. pp. 222 f.

[3] Overton, *op. cit.* vol. ii. p. 61.

[4] For Simeon see H. C. G. Moule, *Charles Simeon* ('Leaders of Religion'; London, 1892); Overton, *op. cit.* pp. 52 f.; Balleine, *op. cit.* pp. 87 f.

spiritual influences came from High Church quarters—in this case the book, 'Whole Duty of Man,' whoever may be its author, Archbishop Sharp, William Law, or somebody else. It was only at a later stage that through John Venn he came in contact with Evangelicalism proper. From 1783 till his death he strongly influenced both undergraduates and townspeople, from his pulpit in Trinity Church, when once the ice of prejudice was broken. With all his human weaknesses, he is one of the bravest figures of his University and his Church, through his sincere and unworldly piety, and his zeal in the pastoral office. Before Newman the century saw no other man who so powerfully influenced young minds, and perhaps Newman's personal influence in Oxford was never so great as Simeon's in Cambridge. His name lives on in the foundation, the Simeon Trust, the object of which is to make the degenerate system of patronage in the English Church serve a good object; when by inheritance a sum of money came to Simeon, he gave it as the nucleus of a fund for buying livings, and by the deed of gift he engaged the managers of the fund to treat it with the greatest conscientiousness. Through Simeon and Milner Evangelicalism profoundly influenced the religious and theological life of Cambridge. But in Oxford it never took root. It won no entry into any of the greater colleges.

We have only been able to take a hasty glance at the most important of the centres, from which the seed of Evangelicalism was scattered over the country. It was scattered widely and penetrated deep. Opponents, who branded everything that smacked of 'enthusiasm,' all inner warmth, or deeper spiritual views with the name of Evangelical, took care that many were reckoned with the party who had little or no sympathy for its doctrinal peculiarities. A vigorous and well-organised practical activity could not escape making an impression on minds free of prejudice. There was no other flag round which those could rally who wished actively to fight the good fight. The gift of the spoken and written word was richly given to a Hannah More, a Simeon, a Wilberforce; but through their lives they were far more eloquent preachers. 'Though doubtless, in certain points, I entertain a view different from them, I can safely say, that they belong to the elect of earth, and I say now, what I should desire to say on my deathbed,

*sit mea anima cum istis.'* So wrote one who nevertheless must be reckoned as a High Churchman.[1]

In spite of all this, on the whole one must concede the correctness of the Anglican historians' statement that the strength of Evangelicalism as a spiritual factor was on the wane in the first generation of the nineteenth century. It is right to this extent, that it was not to Evangelicalism as a party that the future belonged, that it was no longer what corresponded to the need of the age. It is no unique development. (Words which were coined to express the desire and holy fears of hungry souls are changed in the mouths of repeaters to meaningless shibboleths, to a pious dialect, and thus may give the appearance of piety to a tame worldliness which without loss abandons more robust pleasures for the comfort of the spiritual tea-meeting. First a burning desire for a holy life, for a walk in God's sight—now a narrow-minded moral code, which only claims respect for its conventional ordinances. The earlier Evangelicals had been animated by a strong social passion: in the time of the Epigoni whom we have nearest in view, the spiritual and temporal needs of the masses were scarcely less than in Wesley's time; rather the fuel of social revolution seemed to be piled up as never before or later in the history of England; and though it were unjust to forget the self-denying apostleship of individuals in the working-class districts of Liverpool or Manchester, it is yet not in such surroundings that the Evangelicalism of the early nineteenth century was most at home; it was better suited to the fashionable society of watering-places, to Bath, Tunbridge Wells, or the Cheltenham which to Simeon was 'almost a heaven on earth.'

The criticism is, however, only partly justified. If Evangelicalism lacked insight into the deepest needs of the time, what other contemporary religious school had the right to cast the first stone? Certainly not the High Church party. If its members are accused of having hardened into a narrow legality, this applies properly to the shell, the dry husk of Evangelicalism, which remained after the life that was once bred in it was taken up and made good in the spiritual life of Anglo-Saxon

[1] C. Forster, *The Life of John Jebb, Bishop of Limerick* (3rd ed., 1851). p. 61.

Christianity. From the theoretical point of view the generation which grew up under the influence of the Anglican Renaissance, or took its standard from it, found Evangelicalism still more unsatisfactory. It was found contradictory, that men who rivalled the High Churchmen in devotion to the Prayer Book and to the traditional forms of worship, held a conception of the Church which only applied to the invisible body of believers the attributes 'one, holy, and Catholic.'[1] We need not now stop for a comparative estimate of this view and the High Anglican theory of the visible Church, with the episcopal succession as its most important criterion. If the individualistic tendency in Evangelicalism must not be exaggerated, yet Evangelicals found their desire of participation in the spiritual common life satisfied by societies more than by the historical Church. Hence followed a lamentable limitation of their spiritual horizon: their theology was cut off from fruitful contact with the life of the age, and the Divine activity was for them similarly cramped; the central fact of revelation came to stand in isolation from its universal context. Newman once[2] formulated his attacks on the dogmatic standpoint of Protestantism—and he knew Protestantism chiefly from the experiences of his Evangelical youth—thus: it lacks clearness, it has stopped half way in its development of doctrine, but its natural development leads to rationalism. The onesidedness of the criticism rests on the standpoint of the critic. Inherited from the Greek Fathers, the dogma of the early Church dominates his conception: with the Evangelicals, Sin, Atonement, and Sanctification, the new Protestant version of Augustine, take the same central place. The contrasts between the definite Anglicanism as it was, and as it became during the nineteenth century on the one side, and the Protestantism which the Evangelicals represented and represent on the other, has been expressed in antinomies. There Christology, here Soteriology; there Incarnation, here Atonement; there *Christus Consummator*, here *Christus Redemptor*.[3] But this problem can here only be stated.

[1] Cp. Overton, *The English Church in the Nineteenth Century*, p. 97.

[2] 'Prospects of the Anglican Church,' *Essays Critical and Historical*, vol. i. p. 296 (reprinted from *British Critic*, 1839); cp. Storr, *Development of English Theology*, pp. 65 f.

[3] Storr, *op. cit.* p. 73.

Our treatment of Evangelicalism may perhaps seem unnecessarily diffuse in an essay the object of which is to set forth the rise of a movement generally regarded as its direct opposite. But the reason has already been indicated; in my opinion Evangelicalism has its large share in bringing about the new Anglicanism of the later nineteenth century—it is, so to say, one of its components. This may seem to be a paradox, and it certainly does not hold good, if in Neo-Anglicanism one only sees a certain conception of the Church, its functions and ministry. But it has also another and perhaps more essential side. It is a profoundly and entirely religious movement. It kindles the 'enthusiasm' which was excommunicated in the old system, and it wakes to life an intense need of devotion and a thirst for holiness, which makes it worthy of a high place in the history of religion, whatever one may say of its Church conception. It is in this, it seems to me, that we have a right to see in Neo-Anglicanism the heir of Evangelicalism. For the connection between Evangelicalism and Neo-Anglicanism we may also quote the utterances of a highly competent judge, Gladstone. In an essay on 'The Evangelical Movement, its Parentage, Progress, and Issue,'[1] he points out that it was after the 'Tracts for the Times' began to come out that the positive content of the Evangelical preaching went through the natural channels of the English Church. It had also its negative side, which Gladstone sees in defective conception of the Church and Sacraments, but on all its other sides Evangelicalism was appropriated by the English Church taken as a whole. The founders of the Oxford School were, of course, not conscious in how high a degree they carried on the tradition of Evangelicalism along with something else. They were in effect at first this added something so seriously and fundamentally that they seemed to be it exclusively. And this something was, of course, their sacramental view of the Church. At times it seemed to make them neglect the needs of the individual soul. But Gladstone lays stress on the point that 'the pith and life of the Evangelical teaching, as it consists in the reintroduction of Christ Our Lord to be the woof and warp of preaching, was the great gift of the movement to the

[1] *Gleanings of Past Years* (London, 1879), vol. vii. (reprint from *British Quarterly Review*, 1879).

teaching Church, and has now penetrated and possessed it on a scale so general that it may be considered as pervading the whole mass.'

This fact makes it probable that a direct connection existed between Tractarianism and Evangelicalism. Evangelicals heartily agreed in condemning the Oxford Movement. But the clergy of the eighteenth century did the same with Wesley and Whitefield, though their work led to a reformation within the Church itself. Cannot something corresponding have been the case with Evangelicalism and the Oxford Movement? And the Tractarians were in great measure recruited from Evangelicals. Gladstone perhaps lays greater stress on the tendency of the Oxford Movement to approximate to Rome than one is justified in doing, at least with respect to its earlier stage, and derives precisely this tendency from Evangelicalism. That amongst those who went over to Rome between 1840 and 1860 many were brought up in Evangelical surroundings is obvious. It is enough to name Newman, Manning, and three sons of William Wilberforce. It can be said of those and of many others that as they went from Oxford to Rome, so they had already marched from Clapham to Oxford. Perhaps one may ask, if this surprising fact cannot equally be explained by the fact that the pendulum of human life, when once set going, has an innate tendency to swing to the utmost extreme, and if it really need be put down to the account of Evangelicalism. In any case, Gladstone's study is one of the most valuable contributions to showing the inner relations of Evangelicalism as a historical precursor of Neo-Anglicanism. 'The Evangelical movement filled men so full with the wine of spiritual life that larger and better vessels were required to hold it.'

Now I will conclude by summarily sketching the ways in which the influence may have been mediated. The connection with older Wesleyanism is plainest. In the next chapter we shall treat the direct proof found in the fact that Methodist influence, combined with High Churchmanship, points in the direction of Neo-Anglicanism. The great importance of the older Calvinistic Evangelicalism within the Church for Newman's personal development has been illustrated above. Finally, we have to take into account how

several of the men of the Oxford Movement, *e.g.* Newman and the brothers Wilberforce, were brought up in Evangelical surroundings. However strong the theoretical change in their lives may have been, they are no exception to the rule that early impressions are seldom erased. In some cases perhaps, as was just now pointed out in connection with Gladstone's remarks, we can see in the radical violence of the change an after-effect of the youthful influences. Those leaders of the Oxford Movement who came out of High Church homes always showed a greater power of resistance to Roman temptations.

## CHAPTER IV

### THE FORERUNNERS OF NEO-ANGLICANISM

The dividing line between Evangelicals and High Churchmen was definite. A Hannah More and a Wilberforce no doubt won respect outside the limits of their own party. But the weakness of that kind of High Churchmanship which was preached by Daubeny and his likes, and its inability to win the ear of the age, rested perhaps not least on the fact that they so entirely cut themselves off from the spiritual well which streamed forth in the Evangelical revival of the eighteenth century, though the stream had weakened before it reached the shores of Clapham. The reality of religion was in that well, and there was very little of religion in the age besides it. In men like Daubeny we find little more than ecclesiasticism, which is not always the companion of religion. Only when ecclesiasticism was penetrated by the religious force which Evangelicalism contained, especially in its older form, could it once more become formative. To have accomplished this fusion is what gives Alexander Knox his importance in the history of English theology. Along with Knox must be mentioned his friend and pupil, John Jebb, Bishop of Limerick, more than Knox perhaps a High Churchman of older type, but in all essentials sharing his views, and sometimes doing little more than repeat them. These two men may in a marked degree be called the forerunners of the Oxford Movement, or perhaps one should rather say: the study of their ideas shows us better than anything else how the religious and theological values, which the Oxford Movement was called to bring to light, were derived from the storehouses of the Anglican Church, to which the Movement was not the only possessor of the key.

Knox was born at Limerick in 1757; he was descended from the same family which gave Scotland its reformer. The strongest influence upon his youth came doubtless from acquaintance with John Wesley, who wrote a series of letters of spiritual advice to Knox between 1776 and 1785, which have been preserved.[1] Though later in some years of dissipation he shook off the minute control of his life which he had been taught by the spiritual father of his youth, the traces of this influence never were entirely lost, and when in 1794 he returned to a life more in accord with his true nature the old impression came back with new strength. Wesley's influence, or if one prefers the word, the Methodist system, became one of the constituent elements of his religious personality, and the strong High Church tendency he unites with it is also perhaps in no small degree a legacy from Wesley the High Churchman. Knox was himself conscious of this: 'In a word,' he writes once to an acquaintance, 'I consider John Wesley as promulgating in his latter days, above all uninspired men who had gone before him, Christianity in all its efficacy, and yet in all its amiability. On this ground he appears to me the first competent unveiler of that concentration of the evangelic rays, which has been so wonderfully (and I would almost venture to say exclusively) insphered in our established Liturgy. And I trust the time will yet come, and that it is not at any very great distance (though I confess as yet I see no sign of its approach), when the providential deposit which distinguishes the Church of England will be rightly appreciated; and Mr. Wesley's designation, as the precursive announcer of its hitherto undeveloped excellences, will be fully understood and adequately recognised.'[2] If I should venture to indicate the points in which Knox has been the heir of Methodist evangelicalism in its Wesleyan form — Whitefield's Calvinism was unsympathetic to him—I might quote what one could describe as perfectionist ethics, which hold up the ideal of complete holiness, instead of the compromises he saw and lamented in the various forms of Protestantism—and partly the high estimation of the place of feeling in the world of religion, which causes the enthusiasm that the eighteenth century called heretical, to enter as a warm

[1] Part IV of Knox's *Remains*, pp. 1–20. [2] *Remains*, iii. p. 489.

and life-giving stream both into his personal piety and his theology.

After some experiments, partly in the slippery paths of Irish politics, partly as private secretary for some time to Lord Castlereagh, he was compelled to retire by an illness which expressed itself in melancholy and neurotic temperament. Thus began the hermit life in Dublin which was to last till his death in 1831, only interrupted by occasional visits to the country seats of friends. His influence during his life scarcely extended beyond the narrow circle which benefited by his brilliant conversation or was edified by his letters, which often grew into small dissertations. These were posthumously published in four parts (I and II in 1834; III and IV in 1837), with the title—'Remains of Alexander Knox, Esq.' The numerous letters to his lifelong friend and confidant, Bishop Jebb, were published separately.[1] Knox has scarcely anywhere been estimated at his true value in the history of Anglican Theology, no doubt because he was overshadowed by the great Anglican Renaissance. This, too, now is matter of history, but hitherto its nearness has hardly permitted the historian to get a proper grasp of the problem of its rise and antecedents.[2] For this reason especially we must pay special attention to Knox.

If one may regard the leading conception of Neo-Anglicanism in its earlier phase as expressed in the term *Via Media*, Newman coined the term and gave it wide currency. But if we search for the oldest document in the nineteenth century, where the conception is clearly comprehended and expressed, I believe we shall find it in these words of Knox in a letter to Jebb of 1813: 'What perverse influence the nickname of Protestant has had upon our Church. . . . It will perhaps be at length discovered, that there is a *medium* between the two extremes, which combines the advantages and shuts out the evils of both, which Vincentius clearly

[1] *Thirty Years' Correspondence between John Jebb, D.D., F.R.S., Bishop of Limerick, Ardfert and Aghadoe, and Alexander Knox, Esq., M.R.I.A.*, edited by the Rev. Charles Forster, B.D., 2 vols. (London, 1834).

[2] The first adequate estimate of Knox is in Storr, *The Development of English Theology in the Nineteenth Century*, pp. 85–91. The question of the dependence of the Oxford Movement on Knox and Jebb is discussed in Appendix I.

marked out in the fifth century, and which at this day exists nowhere but in the genuine central essence of our own reformed Episcopal Church.'[1] This is further developed in a letter of 1816 'On the Situation and Prospects of the Established Church.'[2] Hitherto, he says, there has been no feature so prominent in the English Church as its fears of what might be called Popery. 'Dread of Transubstantiation has made the sacrament a ceremony; and, to ward off infallibility, every man has been encouraged to shape a creed for himself. But if Popery can be a Charybdis, there is a Scylla, on the other side, not less dangerous. But it will be still more useful to learn that in the mixed mass of the Roman Catholic religion there is gold, and silver, and precious stones, as well as wood, hay, and stubble, and that everything of the former nature is to be as carefully preserved, as everything of the latter is to be wisely rejected.'

It was with this principle that the English Reformation began. Certainly the Protestant element—doubtless by the dispensation of Providence, and in accordance with what the age demanded—came to set the Catholic in the background. But the latter came to its own in the 1662 revision of the Prayer Book. In this, too, Knox sees a dispensation of Providence. 'What then can we suppose, but that those changes were meant by Providence to subserve ulterior movements, to lie dormant, as it were, until nearer "the time of the end," when it might suit the order of Providence that what was before deposited as seed should grow up into a rich and luxuriant harvest?' Now the time must be ripe for a juster appreciation of the treasures concealed within the Church of Rome. 'What copious matter for profound and interesting study would that wonderful concrete of truth and error, of greatness and meanness, of beauty and deformity, the Roman Catholic Church, afford. Still under that rubbish must be all the rich results of a providential training of Christ's mystical Kingdom, for fourteen centuries.' And with closer consideration one will perhaps find valuable truths exactly in what were regarded as the grossest errors of the Roman Church. Thus, for example, in the matter of Confession.

[1] *Thirty Years' Correspondence*, vol. ii. pp. 122 f.
[2] *Remains*, i. pp. 48–62.

But Knox is far from dreaming of any reunion with Rome.[1] On the contrary he sees a dispensation of Providence in the separation within the Church produced by the Reformation. 'Was it not, then, worthy of Providence, when the ripeness of time came, to set one half of the Western Church loose, to go in search of new benefits, and to leave the other half on its old unaltered ground, in order that by retaining everything, it might lose nothing?' He regards also the providential task of the English Church as being this: 'In this profound appointment, I think it is the destiny of the Church of England to form an intermediate link. If a future union of the whole were to be provided for, if the basis of a temperament were to be laid into which both extremes could meet, such a measure would appear indispensable.'[2] This conception of the content and meaning of *Via Media* has a depth and range of vision which makes the Neo-Anglican conception of the Church appear narrow and poor.

The same thought occurs in a letter to Hannah More 'On the Designs of Providence respecting the Christian Church,'[3] framed in an imposing general view of Church history. Knox sees a correspondence between the division of the early Church with a Greek and a Latin half, and the separation of the Reformed Church into a Lutheran and Calvinistic branch: the Lutheran answers to the Greek, and the Calvinist to the Latin, 'the first rejecting the dogmas of Augustin, and leaning more to the liberality of Chrysostom; the latter, forming those dogmas into a more compact and systematised form.' 'In Britain—(wonderful Britain!)—the two great members of the Reformation meet, the Calvinist Church being established in the northern division, the Lutheran Church in the southern. In England . . . all is peculiar. In the Establishment, the theology, common to

[1] 'Letter to the Rev. James Dunn on the Impossibility of Union between the Churches of England and Rome' (*Remains*, iii. pp. 314–330). Rome's claim of authority over the individual conscience is tyrannical. The authority claimed by the English Church is limited to public worship and teaching. Moreover, Rome has abandoned Vincentius' principle of Catholicity.

[2] Knox adds: 'In this view, old Lord Chatham's well-known jeer at the Established Church, as having a Popish Liturgy, Calvinist Articles, and an Arminian Clergy, may have had in it far more of the nature of an encomium, than either he or his hearers were likely to imagine' (*Remains*, i. p. 366, in 'Letter to D. Parken on the Character of Mysticism' of 1811).

[3] *Op. cit.* iii. pp. 103–230.

Luther and Melanchthon, was adopted in the Articles; but the unmixed piety of the Primitive Church was retained in the daily Liturgy, and occasional offices. Thus, our Church, by a most singular arrangement of Providence, has, as it were, a Catholic soul united to a Lutheran body of the best and mildest temperament.'

It is in the Liturgy that Knox sees especially the sign of the Catholicity of his Church. 'I know nothing settled, in the whole reformed body, but the Liturgy of the Church of England.[1] To the Liturgy, therefore . . . I adhere, as the . . . silver cord . . . which unites us to the great mystical body; other parts of our constitution (such as superadded prayers and the Thirty-nine Articles) were no doubt seen to be expedient, especially considering the middle point we were to occupy, and (I trust) the conciliatory function, to be one day exercised by us. But our vitality as a Church consists in our identity of organisation, and of mental character with the Church Catholic; and as our unbroken episcopate implies the first, our Liturgy—and that alone—contains the other.' [2]

Of these two Catholic principles it is to be noticed that Knox always lays the greater weight on the Liturgy; to no point does he so often return as to the merits of the Book of Common Prayer; and the Anglican Service, in its careful arrangement, with altars, vestments, saints' days, antiphons, was the object of his passionate love. To the two can be added a third: respect for the early Church as the highest Court of Appeal. Thus we have the three basic principles of Anglicanism, though not as yet squeezed in the strait-waistcoat of the Neo-Anglican conception of the Church. The chief virtue of the Liturgy, according to Knox, is that it mediated the piety of the early Church, in its crystallised

[1] *Op. cit.* p. 61, in 'Letter to Dr. Woodward on the Central Character of the Church of England' (1812).

[2] In the doctrine of the Eucharist Knox finds an example of how a Catholic idea found expression in the Liturgy of 1548, chiefly owing to Ridley, who had taken the old Catholic doctrine from Ratramnus, was afterwards modified, when Cranmer was more strongly influenced from the Reformed camp, but was replaced by the revision of 1662. According to Knox the English Church has maintained the Real Presence but rejected Transubstantiation ('Letter to John S. Harford, prefatory to the Treatise on the Eucharist' of 1826, in *Remains*, ii. pp. 138–164).

forms of prayer, faithfully preserved in the Latin language by the Church of Rome for centuries.[1] In his criticism of certain doctrines he is inclined to point out that, 'when I deprecate doctrines, I mean not any Catholic verity; such as the Universal Church holds in common.' In the preaching of the Church continued through the ages he hears, as it were, a mighty harmony in which there are no discords: 'Do not rely on the uncertain sounds of barely three centuries, when you can listen to the harmonious voices of recognised wisdom and universally respected piety through all the ages of the Catholic Church. . . . We shall find, if we enquire, that God has never left Himself without witness in the hierarchical Church proper, that along with the densest darkness of the Papacy the light of Catholicism could not be quenched. . . . From Anselm and Bernard in the twelfth century to the earliest Fathers, we can trace an unbroken succession and hear unchangeable witness.'[2] Here, too, there is an undertone of *quod ubique, quod semper*; and in a letter 'On the Fathers of the Christian Church and on Catholic Tradition'[3] it sounds out with full strength: 'Among the varying winds of doctrine, some ground on which to anchor is infinitely desirable; and what ground can be comparable to this?' No doubt the Church of England cannot, like Rome, set tradition as equally important by the side of Scripture. The unique authority of the latter she has always maintained—but at the same time, she has with one voice recognised the tradition of which

[1] *Remains*, iv. p. 482, cp. p. 301 f. ('Letter to Hannah More' of 1805); 'I trust you do not doubt my love to the Established Church: but it is not for its doctrines I love it. I prize some single collects above all the theological Articles. In my judgment what will make the Church of England live, is, that it has adopted and embodied, with singularly happy selection, the sublime piety of the primitive Church. This is done in the Liturgy. In the Articles it draws its materials, as I conceive, and speaks (though wonderfully moderated) that theological language which commenced with St. Austin. This, I own, had its use. But abstractedly, I for myself prefer the Liturgy to the Articles, the latter being, in my mind, very much human, the former little short of divine.'

[2] It does not need to be pointed out that this view of the unanimous voice of Christian antiquity cannot be maintained in the face of critical enquiry any more than the later Tractarian position. An interesting chapter, which might illustrate Knox's use of the early Fathers as authorities, is his doctrine of Justification, in which he definitely rejects the Protestant view (see 'On Justification,' to D. Parken (1810), *Remains*, i. pp. 256–288).

[3] *Remains*, i. pp. 277–313 (especially p. 291).

the Fathers and the Councils were the chief exponents as an inestimable help alongside of Holy Scripture, both for the interpretation of what otherwise might remain ambiguous, and for the close explanation of what has only been given in general terms.

So it is before the tribunal of the early Church that Knox arraigns the sterile High Churchmanship of his time, and he finds its judgment favourable to Methodism and to 'enthusiasm.' 'Those movements of piety, which belong to the mind and heart, have been rather suspected and discountenanced, than explained or cultivated; until, from its being caricatured by vulgar advocates, inward religion is little less than systematically exploded. It is in this spirit, that the present champions for what they think High Church orthodoxy, are combating their "Evangelical" opponents. They involve in their attack, all that is venerable and valuable, with that which is really exceptionable, and justly to be resisted. . . . Were these men acquainted with the chain of traditional truth, which Divine Providence kept unbroken through the darkest ages, they would discover in the prayers, which they constantly read or hear, the well-digested substance of that which (certainly in an ill-digested form) they combat and vilify. They would find, to their confusion, that Gregory, the chief author of those prayers, was, what they, in their ignorance, would call a Methodist: that is, one who prized, cultivated and dwelt upon in all his discourses and writings those interior effects of Divine Grace, which designate their nature to the happy possessor by a strength, which no mere human effort could possess, and by a purity, of which God only could be the Author.'[1] With satisfaction he finds in the Fathers of the Church proof that the psychological phenomenon of conversion was observed and given a religious value long before the age of Methodism.[2]

In the preaching of his day he misses the spirit. 'It is the result of a kind of intellectual pumping. There is nothing welling up from the source.'[3] He misses a preaching

[1] *Remains*, i. pp. 58 f.

[2] In a letter to Bishop Jebb he points to a description of a conversion in St. Bernard which goes further than what appeals to him: 'I never saw a more complete piece of Methodism' (*Thirty Years' Correspondence between J. Jebb and A. Knox*, i. p. 126).

[3] *Op. cit.* i. p. 14.

of the dreadful condition of the unregenerate, of the absolute necessity of a radical inner change, which makes a man what by nature he is not.[1] With this Methodistic High Churchman are found already in characteristic blend the elements which were to produce the Anglican Renaissance. But while in the latter they had to be welded together with hasty hammer-strokes, as in an armourer's smithy, while the eye with anxiety and eagerness looks through the window to see if the cuirass will be ready before the hostile host has arrived, the time passed quietly in the Dublin study; what was created there, was not forged armour, but rather a dress which more supplely adapted itself to the true form of the Anglican religion.

The most consistent formulation of Knox's conception of the Church we find in a writing which bears not his but Bishop Jebb's name. We have already met him, and quoted his correspondence, which hitherto has chiefly been made to contribute to the characterisation of Knox. Knox is doubtless the more important of the two friends, who faithfully stood by each other's side from the school-days at Londonderry. Jebb's interest was far more occupied with speculations on laws of poetic composition in the Bible : [2] but letters from him contain also thoughts of independent value and are important for the character of the conception of the Church, which was common to both friends,[3] and they show that he, like Knox, was on intimate terms with the Evangelical circle at Clapham. Most important for our object is a little essay added as an appendix to a volume of sermons published by Jebb in 1815.[4] It has been generally recognised that this

[1] *Op. cit.* i. pp. 17, 22.

[2] It was by an *Essay on Sacred Literature* of 1820 that he won his greatest fame with contemporaries.

[3] In a letter of 1807 Jebb quotes with satisfaction a work which sets out to prove that the English Church is rather Lutheran than Calvinistic, but desires Knox to undertake to show 'that we are Melancthonian, rather than Lutheran' (*Correspondence*, vol. i. p. 349). He shares Knox's view of Methodism.

[4] *Sermons on Subjects chiefly Practical, with illustrative Notes and an Appendix, relating to the Character of the Church of England as distinguished from other branches of the Reformation and from the Modern Church of Rome*, by Rev. J. Jebb, M.A. (London, 1815). It was separately published in 1839, with the title *A Tract for all Times, Peculiar Character of the Church of England.*

gives Knox's thought at least as much as Jebb's.[1] Its motto is derived from Mosheim's 'Institutiones historiae ecclesiasticae,'[2] and like the title concerns the theme of *Via Media*: 'Illa religionis veteris correctio, quae Britannos aeque a pontificiis, atque a reliquis familiis, quae pontificis dominationi renuntiarunt, sejungit.'

It has been said of the essay that it almost might have come out as one of the 'Tracts for the Times,' and it also forms the most systematic exposition of the principle *quod ubique, quod semper*, which saw the light before Newman. At the risk of repeating what has been quoted already in similar form out of Knox's writings we must take a short survey of this document, which is so important for the characterisation of Anglicanism.

The most distinguishing feature of the English Church is, he says, her respect for the primitive period. But she differs from Rome in that she derives from Scripture alone all doctrines of faith to which binding force is to be ascribed, but at the same time constantly takes as a guide to the interpretation of Scripture 'the concurrent sense of the Church Catholic,' and herein is different from all other reformed bodies, in that Continental Protestantism has as its principle to let Scripture alone interpret itself. The latter rejects the authority of the Church as a guide to the interpretation of Scripture and justifies the rejection by the absence of an infallible criterion showing where the true Church is to be found (Sleidanus is quoted). But the English Church is convinced that such a criterion is given in the episcopate. Since this Church, then, does not entirely reject authority, she has been able to appropriate the spiritual work of preceding generations. But Continental Protestantism, which points every Christian direct to the Bible, thus forces the individual to begin from the beginning and travel again the same road on which thousands have preceded him.

But Vincent, in contrast to the Church of Rome, emphasises the individual decision as a binding duty, only that the individual has to fix his eyes on, and be guided by, a cloud

[1] In a letter of 1826 Knox speaks of a writing 'which indeed contains the conjoint thoughts of the Bishop of Limerick and myself,' in this referring to the Appendix (*Remains*, iv. p. 463).

[2] Saec. xvi. sect. iii. pars ii. cap. ii.; § 17, p. 678.

of New Testament witnesses. Vincent demands no unlimited submission. It is not limitation that he intends to promote, but instead he would give a wider outlook, a ' rejection of all limited ideas, all party prejudices, all accidental misunderstandings, and a reference to the widest possible range of enquiry, the purest source of instruction.' Authority is to help and support, not to replace, the individual judgment. Thus when England's Church follows the lead of the fathers in ascribing the second place to tradition, she opposes Rome, which puts Scripture and tradition on a level. Rome puts as highest court in questions of belief the Pope of each age in place of the early Church. So the Church of England has followed a *middle course*. She has retained the thought of the Church's mystical body as a unity through the ages, and of communion with the blessed dead. In support of his view, Jebb adds in conclusion a *catena* of expressions from the fathers of the Anglican Church, from Ridley to Bull, and sums up thus: ' The Church of England steers a middle course, she reveres Scripture, she respects tradition, she encourages enquiry, but she bridles presumption. She bows to the authority of the past, but she recognises no living authority on earth.' Therein she has an infallible guarantee against error and apostasy. It was especially by this treatise that the Jebb-Knox conception of the Church influenced contemporary thought. The thought of *Via Media* roused immediate opposition among both Protestants and Roman Catholics,[1] but at the same time it is plain that it found an echo, especially among the more intellectually alert of the rising generation.[2]

[1] Jebb's biographer, C. Forster (*Life of John Jebb, D.D., F.R.S.*, 3rd ed., London, 1851), reports that his fundamental principle, the golden rule of Vincentius, was attacked by a writer in the *Christian Observer*, and it is, adds Forster in his Preface, dated 1836, ' at the moment in which I write, the subject of a controversy publicly at issue, between an accomplished French Ecclesiastic, and some distinguished divines of Oxford,' which refers to Newman's controversy with a French abbé, which resulted in the former's *Lectures on the Prophetical Office of the Church*, 1837.

[2] Knox, in a letter of 1827, reports that he met a young man of University education, who expressed to him ' as intelligent an eulogium, as I had perhaps heard from anyone,' on the Appendix (*Correspondence*, vol. ii. p. 561). In 1836 one of the more notable in the second rank of the Oxford Movement, W. F. Hook, confesses that he was a warm admirer of the Bishop of Limerick, and in particular got the greatest benefit from ' the admirable Appendix to his sermons ' (*Jebb's Life*, p. 66).

## CHAPTER V

### THE ROMANTIC MOVEMENT AND NEO-ANGLICANISM

It has often been said that the Oxford Movement is properly to be regarded as a phase of the Romantic Movement.[1] The assertion contains, like all such classifications, truth and untruth. To begin with, scarcely any historical figures are so shaped that they will exactly fit any of the compartments in the historian's shelves. Romanticism is in itself a many-sided term. It is not our object to attempt a definition or to clear up our conceptions about Romanticism in general. But it must only be pointed out that the term Romantic or Neo-Romantic as it is applied to denote the most important factor in the spiritual composition of the earlier nineteenth century, embraces conflicting elements. Different reactions against the eighteenth century are united; feeling reacts against the tyranny of reason; historical and natural growths take the place of honour instead of geometrical constructions; the experience of the race and society's claim for authority once more win recognition, man steps out of the correct parlour of reason and is amazed at the irrational depths of existence discernible both in the history of the race and in the life of nature. But another element comes in, which seems to conflict with the former; the individualism, which was itself a child of the eighteenth century, and a grand-child of the Renaissance, remains secure in the seat of honour. The Ego becomes more and more the centre of being. By being reflected through its lens everything gets its value, not to say its reality. Nature itself is interesting only as the mirror in which the Ego discerns its own face magnified to fantastic proportions. In wonderful

[1] *E.g.* Inge, *Outspoken Essays*, p. 31; Fairbairn, *Catholicism, Roman and Anglican*, pp. 94 f., 294.

refractions and combinations the reaction against Rousseau's influence is combined with his own spirit.

Thus Romanticism conceals the seed of a development which, when its true nature is revealed, is anything but favourable for Neo-Anglicanism, though the self-mirroring, which was a feature of the age, may be observed in the leaders of the Oxford Movement, and in its measure contributes to heighten their purely personal interest. It cannot be a unique phenomenon that the champions of authority in private are the greatest individualists.

But if one regards that side of Romanticism which consisted in a fresh appreciation of the legacy of history and the race, and which sought its ideals and its motives in past times and particularly the Middle Ages, it certainly prepared the ground for the renewers of authoritative religion in England. And its sense of the mysterious depth of being in the human soul and in the natural world (*omnia exeunt in mysteria*) made it also an important factor in the history of religion. In so far as it was affected by both these features of Romanticism, the Oxford Movement is certainly akin to the contemporary religious currents in other countries, which in France were represented by Chateaubriand and De Maistre, the apostle of Papalism, and in Germany by Görres, Schlegel, Novalis, and Stolberg.[1] But the parallel is far from complete. This wave of romantic religion, which chiefly benefited Rome, had also reached England. It had a typical forerunner in K. H. Digby, who took his degree at Cambridge in 1819. He devoted himself to the study of mediaeval antiquities and scholastic philosophy and his passion for the romantic ages led him to Catholicism. He embodied his thoughts in the work 'The Broad Stone of Honour,' where numerous quotations from Stolberg, Görres, Schlegel, Lamennais, and De Maistre witness to his dependence on the reactionary romanticism of the Continent.[2] To the same school belonged the architect Pugin, and it had its centre in the Roman Catholic seminary of Oscott, near Birmingham.[3] The Oxford Movement, and the tendency of which it is the expression, can only

[1] Fairbairn, *op. cit.* pp. 96–111.
[2] Beers, *A History of English Romanticism* (London, 1902), pp. 363 ff.
[3] Cornish, *op. cit.* vol. i. p. 336.

to a small extent be explained from the literary currents of the age. It was prepared for by these, and appropriated some of their thoughts; but it was not evoked by them, nor can it, unless violence is done to the material, be classified only as part of the Romantic Movement.

In English Romanticism the reawakening of the historical sense is especially represented by Walter Scott, but it constitutes also an important element in the group of writers who are usually associated under the name of the Lake School, though their importance chiefly lies in the deepening of the observation of Nature.

We remember how 'An hereditary High Churchman' in his reminiscences emphasised the impressions he received in his youth from the author of the Waverley novels. Here he found how the Church of Rome had more than its appointed share of vestments, music, and other apparatus of cult, and this gave him a longing for a richer development of ritual in the English Church. And the opportunities of private confession which the Established Church afforded, seemed to him a poor equivalent of the spiritual relation between priest and penitent, which he found in the picture of Roland Graeme, kneeling in confession before Father Ambrose in 'The Abbot.'[1] Perhaps a similar impression was made on Newman's soul when as a boy he lay in bed in the mornings, before it was time to get up, and devoured the Waverley novels.[2] In any case it was certainly his first contact with the Romantic literature. With him the impression so derived came to be mingled with, perhaps overshadowed by contact with the antique. With Sir Walter all classicism had been rooted out. The little Greek he once succeeded in imbibing he soon forgot. Ariosto was more to him than Homer.[3] But he rejoiced in the monkish Latin of Matthew Paris and other mediaeval chroniclers. No poetry appealed to his ear like 'Dies Irae' and other mediaeval hymns. On his death-bed he was heard to murmur 'Stabat Mater dolorosa Juxta crucem lacrymosa, Dum pendebat filius.' So it was he who

[1] *Reminiscences of Forty Years, by an hereditary High Churchman* (J. Hicks Smith) (London, 1868).

[2] Newman, *Letters and Correspondence*, vol. i. p. 10 (ed. 1903, p. 15).

[3] Beers, *op. cit.* p. 5.

both within and far without Anglo-Saxon civilisation introduced contemporaries and future generations to the mediaeval world by novels like 'Ivanhoe' and 'Quentin Durward,' and by all his creations taught men to cast longing eyes at the world of the past. But only an idealised past can be the object of the longing of a later world. Sir Walter's Middle Ages were in no small measure idealised. His poetic intuition combined with a considerable antiquarian learning conjured up in motley forms the life of the chivalrous ages. But he has little to say of the long birth-pangs of modern times. Nor did he learn to understand the religious history of the Middle Ages. He gives the reader at times glimpses of the subdued light of cathedrals. 'Church figures abound on his pages, jolly friars, holy hermits, proud prelates, stern inquisitors, Abbots, Priors, and priests of every kind, but all purely conventional and seen *ab extra*. He could not draw a saint.'[1] He never entered into the soul of the Middle Ages. Dante was unknown to him. Sir Walter's Middle Ages are in a way the literary counterpart of the revived Gothic of the nineteenth century, that imitative architecture which gave its deplorably monotonous frame to Neo-Anglicanism, but with the difference that the creation of literary reconstruction had the hall-mark of genius. Both may, perhaps, have helped unsteady souls to find the way to Rome. But the converts whose destiny was settled by Walter Scott's mediaeval pageants and Pugin's pointed windows are not of those who form an epoch in Church history. Walter Scott's own Protestantism was too deeply rooted in Scottish soil to be pulled up by the mild wind of Romanticism. He was never reactionary like the German Romantics, and in contemporary Catholicism he saw little more than an absurd superstition.

The Oxford Movement was far more oriented to the early Church than to the Middle Ages. So Walter Scott's devotion for the Middle Ages could only partly be appropriated by them. But it, like him, breathed the air of idealised history. And the moral earnestness which marked his work made the novel for the first time the Church's ally. The dislike of Evangelicalism for the fiction of the eighteenth century did not simply rest on obscurantism. We have very definite testimony that the Oxford men were conscious of their debt

[1] Beers, *op. cit.* p. 40.

of gratitude to Walter Scott. Liddon reports of Pusey that in his conversation he often emphasised the relation of the Scotch poet to the Oxford Movement.[1]

Nothing can be more illuminating for the relation of Walter Scott to 'the Catholic revival' and the feelings with which its representatives regarded him than Keble's essay in the *British Critic* of 1838, on the occasion of the publication of Lockhart's 'Memoirs of the Life of Sir Walter Scott.'[2] This essay, the chief part of which is an analysis of the essence of Scott's poetry and its romantic, anti-classic character, culminates in an elegiac contemplation of Sir Walter Scott's religious attitude: 'What if this gifted writer had become the Poet of the Church in as eminent a sense as he was the Poet of Border and Highland chivalry? Such a speculation we trust will be found neither irrelevant nor invidious. It is not forced, nor irrelevant, for it comes spontaneously, we will venture to say, into the minds of most readers at all imbued with Catholic principles. While such contemplate Scott's character, whether as recorded in his life, or displayed in his writings, the feeling which continually suggests itself is: "Cum talis sis, utinam noster esses."'[3] The explanation, Keble thinks, is given by his religious development, especially in the severely Calvinistic atmosphere which prevailed in his parents' home. He turned away from the Presbyterian Establishment: and its cold services and rites disgusted him. And it was only his deeply pious disposition which saved him from altogether turning his back on positive Christianity. Now he joined the Episcopalian Church, 'whose system of government and discipline he believed to be the fairest copy of the primitive polity, and whose litanies and collects he reverenced as having been transmitted to us from the age immediately succeeding that of the Apostles.' His adhesion to the Episcopalian Church had not in the least the character of devotion: during the greater part of his manhood he held private family worship in his dining-room, and Keble notices that in none of his novels is found

[1] *Life of Pusey*, vol. i. p. 254.

[2] Reprinted in Keble, *Occasional Papers and Reviews* (Oxford and London, 1877; posthumously published with preface by Pusey), pp. 1–80.

[3] Keble, *op. cit.* p. 68.

a single attractive Anglican priestly type. But Keble finds a proof that he was well prepared for 'the complete system of the old Catholic Church' in his inclination to the wonderful and supernatural: he had greater disposition to superstition than to unbelief. And in the following sense the author contributes to a characterisation of himself by his interpretation of Scott: 'The tenets of the presence of good and evil Angels, of the power of Sacraments, of communion with the faithful departed, in short the whole of the high doctrine concerning the Holy Catholic Church, and the Communion of Saints, had it been fairly presented to him unincumbered of Romanism, would have found ready entrance into a willing mind.' It is this which gives its pathos to Keble's observation on Scott: the surroundings in which he was placed did not allow his natural piety to take the form it craved, on the contrary were the cause of 'occasional concessions to Liberalism.' Keble thinks it sad that the eye of such a soul should never have rested on the City of God in its true form: 'quae si oculis ejus cerneretur, mirabiles amores excitaret.' And he ends by defending the original Church against the suspicion, that its distinguishing feature was a cold ideality, a feeling of 'severe calmness,' which would have robbed romantic poetry of its charm, if it had taken up the materials afforded by the early Church. The opposite is the case: if one day a poet of the Church should arise, he will find neither feeling nor condition in human life or in God's work which will be out of reach of him or beyond his sphere. 'The hand of our great minstrel would not have been cramped by such a guiding spirit; but his touch in many cases would have been steadier, and his expression more decided, as being sure that he was striking the right note.' An author, far inferior in ability to Scott, Manzoni, has shown how a novel can serve a Church conception. 'Perhaps it is hardly to be expected that a Catholic Homer or Shakespeare should ever arise. It might almost seem to be ordained, that the master-minds of poetry should not be cast on those times and places, where the Church, the only perfect mould to form them in, exists in anything near its original lustre. As perfect kings, so perfect poets, are hardly to be found in her annals: as though it were intended she should work her way still by

instruments comparatively mean and unworthy, and never be tempted to transfer the glory from herself or rather from Him with Whom she is instinct, to any even of her most favoured children.'

We have been led far from Sir Walter Scott. But a thought so typical for Keble as the last quoted bears in its measure witness, how the vein of Romanticism flowed in his own soul, but also how completely it was subordinated to obedience to Christ. A clear summary of the importance Oxford men ascribed to Scott is found in a passage of Newman from the time which marks the zenith of his Anglican career. 'A great poet . . . whatever were his defects, has contributed by his works in prose and verse, to prepare men for some closer and more practical approximation to Catholic truth. The general need of something deeper and more attractive than what had offered itself elsewhere, may be considered to have led to his popularity; and by means of his popularity, he reacted on his readers, stimulating their mental thirst, feeding their hopes, setting before them views, which when once seen, are not easily forgotten, and silently indoctrinating them with nobler ideas, which might afterwards be appealed to as first principles.' [1]

If Walter Scott's chief importance for our purpose is that he roused to life in his generation the historical sense, we find in the Lake School both the romantic elements which prepared the age for a Church revival, though represented in different degrees. Though in the history of literature 'The Ancient Mariner' and 'Christabel' make Coleridge more famous than his philosophical writings, he has interest for us chiefly by his influence on the religious thought of his own, or rather the coming age. Southey has only a traditional claim to be counted of the Lake School. His progressive friendliness to the Church is as typical of the age as that of his poet-brethren in the triumvirate, and we have already quoted a few of his utterances. He is one of the three who perhaps most definitely used his pen in the service of ecclesiastical thought, especially in 'The Book of the Church' (1824) and 'Vindiciae Anglicanae' (1826). But, on the whole, Southey's inspiration

[1] 'Prospects of the Anglican Church,' first printed in *British Critic* for 1839; afterwards reprinted in *Essays, Critical and Historical*, vol. i. p. 268.

did not keep pace with his production, and it scarcely flowed with special abundance in his works on Church subjects. He does not therefore belong to the sowers of the age, and we need scarcely pay further attention to him. Wordsworth, the third of the company, is one of the foremost representatives in the literature of the world of a religious conception of nature, and he decisively influenced the author of 'The Christian Year.' The personal development, through which the Lake poets went, from youthful fanaticism, which dreamed of a communistic Paradise on the Susquehanna or went into raptures over the revolutionary idealism of the Girondists, to an equally sincere devotion in later life to the historical values in Church and State, is in a high degree typical of the generation to which they belonged.

If we have the right at all to enclose Coleridge's daring spirit within the bounds of Romanticism, he is the best example of how the many-sided complex of thoughts and feelings, which we call romantic, concealed the beginning of widely diverging lines of development. Newman saw in Coleridge a pioneer, but was not blind to the fact that his thought was in essential points uncongenial to his own. In the essay of Newman, from which we have just quoted his estimate of Walter Scott, we read: 'While history in prose and verse was thus made the instrument of Church feelings and opinions, a philosophic basis for the same was under formation, in England, by a very original thinker who, while he indulged a liberty of speculation which no Christian can tolerate, and advocated conclusions which were often heathen rather than Christian, yet after all instilled a higher philosophy into enquiring minds, than they had hitherto been accustomed to accept. In this way he made trial of his age, and found it respond to him, and succeeded in interesting its genius in the cause of Catholic truth.'[1]

Coleridge's religious and theological view can scarcely be fixed. It was in constant evolution. From the Voltaire cult of his youth he passed by way of Pantheism with a dash of Neo-Platonism, and the classics of Christian mysticism, to a more positively Christian standpoint. His journey of 1798 brought new food to his intellect, and opened

[1] 'Prospects of the Anglican Church' (*Essays*, vol. i. pp. 268 f.).

out new vistas. He felt Kant's influence, but still more that of Schelling. From Herder and Lessing, but also from Eichhorn, he learned the elementary principles of biblical criticism. It is as a mediator of German theology and philosophy that he became a factor of the first importance in the development of English theological science. During the two last decades of his life at least he desired to be regarded as an orthodox Christian. But his personal religion seems constantly to have fluctuated between a Pantheistic Platonism in Christian dress and a purely Evangelical confidence. In this he took refuge at least in the dark hours of his life, when the wings of speculative thought broke under his diseased mind. It is by 'Aids to Reflection' (1825) and above all in the posthumously published book, 'Confessions of an Inquiring Spirit' (1840), that he influenced and set free the religious thought of his country, and thus influenced it in a direction which was to Newman as unsympathetic as possible. His purely theological thought is the starting-point for the liberal school in English theology, which was to contend for the mastery with the Oxford conception for the rest of the century—and the battle is not yet over, though the positions have changed.

Again by his historical thinking and his Church-conception, he paved the way for Neo-Anglicanism. It is probably to this that Newman refers when, in an autobiographic note, he expresses his surprise how much was found in Coleridge which he regarded as his own.[1] After Coleridge lost faith in the Revolution, he was led to a far higher estimate of the constitutional society as historically built up, probably not without influence from Burke. The last work he himself published was entitled 'On the Constitution of Church and State according to the Idea of each' (1830). Here he maintains the spiritual values which are actually given in national history by the historical development of the ecclesiastical society, but alongside of it he draws the picture of the purely spiritual, supernatural Church, as it showed itself to his eyes as a brilliant vision.

Coleridge's 'On the Constitution of Church and State,'[2]

[1] *Letters and Correspondence*, vol. ii. p. 39 note (ed. 1903, vol. ii. p. 35).

[2] I have used the fourth edition, with preface and notes by H. N Coleridge (London, 1852).

which was published to explain the author's attitude to the Bill for Catholic Emancipation, builds on a double conception of the Church, in that it makes a sharp division between the historical society, as it enters into the English Constitution as a constituent part, and the universal Church of Christ, which knows no limits. The treatise has an important place among the attempts made from time to time to formulate the relation between Church and State. English literature on this point starts, as we said, with Hooker, who in his 'Ecclesiastical Polity' expressed a severely Church-State idea: Church and State are identical, the same society merely seen from different points of view.

Against Hooker's theory Warburton, in his 'Alliance between Church and State' (1736), had produced another, which to some extent was based on the Puritan idea: Church and State are two separate and independent bodies, but—and here Warburton diverges from the Puritans—they need not always so remain, they can enter into an alliance with reciprocal obligations. It is common to both Hooker and Warburton that they make no difference between the national Church and the Christian Church in general. Against this Coleridge sets up a double conception of State, and a double conception of Church. A double conception of the State: one more wide-reaching in which the national Church is comprehended, one more limited where the State is taken as the historical national society *without* the Church. A double conception of Church: for the national Church is something quite different from the universal Christian Church. The latter is the *ecclesia* proper, those called out of the world; the former as entering into the body of the State as a separate entity might rather be called *enklesia*.

The national Church is understood in the widest possible sense. Just as at the conquest of Canaan the Levites' cities were separated from the domains of the eleven tribes, so—according to Coleridge's construction of history—in the Teutonic settlements a part of the soil, *the nationalty*, as distinguished from *the propriety*, was marked off to maintain a special class, whose task would be to look after the interests of culture. The *clerisy* became identical with the learned class. A national Church in this sense need not necessarily

be Christian: it had been found before as well as after the introduction of Christianity. But even after the preaching of Christianity became one of its duties, the national Church retains its comprehensive task. It was the mistake of the Reformation that it overlooked this, and thus trespassed on the *nationalty*, so that it was not sufficient for the task which, according to his conception, it had to fulfil. But all the same, statesmen must learn to see that 'a stable, nationalised, learned class, a national clerisy or Church, is an essential element in a well-ordered State,' and that it cannot be replaced by any substitute, whether Lancaster Schools, *Mechanics' Institutes* or Lecture Societies. The national Church must have its head in the King, and by bond of blood be united to the other members of the body of the State. Recognition of a foreign head and the requirement of celibacy are irreconcilable with the being of a national Church. Over against the national Church stands the universal, the Christian Church *par excellence*. This has four fundamental qualities.[1] 1. It is not a kingdom of this world. On the contrary, it is the antithesis of the world, its necessary complement and corrective. It contributes to the stability of the State by realising its own principles, but for that it does not desire from the State either rewards or dignities. It desires only protection and to be left in peace. 2. The Christian Church is no secret society. It is 'most observable,' a city built upon a hill, which is visible and public. 3. The Christian Church does not stand, as may be said in some measure of the national, in any relation of opposition to the State. The world is its antithesis. But it exists equally in visible counterpart in all different states and societies. The relation of opposition between 1 and 2 is removed by the Church having no visible head. Its Head is Christ alone, and only through its connection with Him, Who is present in each of them, as He in primitive times was present in each local church, do they stand in connection with each other. In supersensual and mystic meaning only is the Church a body. 4. Finally the Church is universal. 'It is neither Anglican, Gallican, nor Roman, neither Latin nor Greek. Even Catholic and Apostolic Church of England is a less safe expression than Church of

[1] *Op. cit.* pp. 138–151.

Christ in England: though the Catholic Church in England, or (which would be still better) the Catholic Church under Christ throughout Great Britain and Ireland is justifiable and appropriate: for through the presence of its only Head and Sovereign, entire in each and one in all, the universal Church is spiritually perfect in every true Church. . . . The true Church of England is the National Church or Clerisy. There exists, God be thanked! a Catholic and Apostolic Church in England: and I thank God also for the constitutional and ancestral Church of England.'[1]

It is plain that the author of 'The Constitution of Church and State' has his place among the pioneers of the Anglican Renaissance. Scarcely anywhere before in literature had the picture of the universal Church been drawn with such rapture. The words 'Catholic and Apostolic' have already something of the magic sound which was to follow them through the century and into the next. The ideal of the supernatural Church, which was Coleridge's, was also that of the Oxford men.[2] They, as he, valued highly the legacy of the national Church. So he must have prepared many for the new creation with which the time was pregnant.

But it seems no less clear that it is to do violence to his system to identify it entirely with the Neo-Anglican view. He never forgets to emphasise the distinction between the universal and the national Church. But he does not fully clear up the relation between the two. Even the universal Church, the Christian Church in the proper sense, existed in the visible Church societies. How then was the English branch of Christ's universal Church related to the hierarchic building of the national Church? This point Coleridge leaves in obscurity. Only this much seems clear, that it is only in its quality of national clerisy that the Church in England can claim the outward privileges it enjoys. Coleridge seems to contemplate no complete identification. With the Oxford men this double character is gone. All is clear with them; it is the English Church in its hierarchy and

[1] *Op. cit.* pp. 150 f.

[2] In an essay in *Harvard Theological Review*, Ser. II (1918), on 'The Place of Coleridge in English Theology,' H. L. Stewart finds his kinship to the Oxford School to consist in their common opposition to Erastianism.

its priesthood, which without reserve and limitations is a part of Christ's universal Church, whose qualities pertain also to her. Instead of the thought of the full presence of the universal Church in the individual Church, the universal Church is identified with the complex of episcopally governed Churches, and is thus conceived in an infinitely more concrete form. Thus every attack on the external order of the Anglican Church becomes a kind of sacrilege. To what extent Coleridge's conception of the Church was consciously used by the Oxford men it is scarcely possible to say. His name occurs in Newman's correspondence for the first time in 1834 in a letter of a friend.[1] Here the book on Church and State does not seem to be alluded to. According to a note of Newman it was in the spring of 1835 that he first made acquaintance with Coleridge's work, and was surprised to find much of what he regarded as his own. On the other hand, it is plain that Coleridge's statement of the problem was certainly fundamental for the later nineteenth-century discussion of this constantly living question. Thus it had special bearing on Gladstone's treatment of it in ' The State in its Relations with the Church ' (1838).

Coleridge's conception of nature had always been religious. His youthful Pantheism saw in everything emanations from God ; Nature itself was never the only primary being, never was identified with God by him as by Shelley.[2] When later his religious development opens his eyes to God's revelation in man, nature becomes subordinate to the life of the human soul, derives its existence solely from mind, or rather it is God in man, which speaks to him not only through his own awakening consciousness, but through the manifold beauty of the world—it becomes rather a means of teaching him what he himself really is. So with Coleridge nature becomes more and more swallowed up in a speculation which has its centre and proper object in the Ego. So he can never entirely give himself up to the contemplation of nature, never entirely open his ear to her message. Or rather he can only do so, when he is directly influenced by his brother poet Wordsworth, who above all others had this gift. In the ' Ancient

[1] *Letters and Correspondence*, vol. ii. p. 39.

[2] S. A. Brooke, *Theology in the English Poets* (London, 1874), p. 79.

Mariner ' nature lives her own life and has her own message to bring. Here it is as if the cloak of philosophic Pantheism was quite thrown down, and the pure Christian faith, which in childlike simplicity dwelt in the depths of the thinker's soul, and, like a Guardian Angel, led him over the abysses of his life, comes forth in all its beauty, when the far-travelled mariner after all his troubles arrives home and exclaims:

O sweeter than the marriage feast,
'Tis sweeter far to me . . .
To walk together to the Kirk,
And all together pray,
While each to his great Father bends,
Old men, and babes, and loving friends,
And youths and maidens gay. . . .
He prayeth best who loveth best
All things both great and small,
For the dear God who loveth us
He made and loveth all.

The Ancient Mariner of the romantic poem is closely related to the man of the age. He had travelled over wide waters, under sun-lit skies, but these had soon given way to icebergs and fog. He longed for the shores of his native land, and, though at first unconsciously, longed for the Church of his native land. Romantic poetry helped this longing to become conscious. Others joined and showed the way. Many also went in at the old gates. Did it happen to some of them as to the man who later visits the church of his home and childhood and finds that a doubtful piety in its zeal for restoration has removed not only soot and cobwebs but its peculiar charm, that the architect, who said he was only restoring its past beauty, has made it an expression of his own thoughts ?

We have already been introduced to Wordsworth. Of the Lake poets he was certainly in the closest relation to the Oxford School. His personal development had closely corresponded with that of Southey and Coleridge. His youthful revolutionary and more or less atheistic idealism was gone, and he had become loyally attached to his country's Church. But his real religion was of definitely mystical type and independent of Church systems.[1] It was not the mysticism of

[1] W. R. Inge, *Christian Mysticism* (4th ed., London, 1918), pp. 305 f.

ecstasy, but certainly that of contemplative absorption. He was a lonely spirit, but a healthy and harmonious man. The stages of mysticism are his means of reaching the object of contemplation. His view of nature is not to be spun out in foggy allegories. It is by an exact observation of the being of things that he aims at listening to their teachings. 'He bids us seek for real and not fanciful analogies. . . . The symbolic value of natural objects is not that they remind us of something that they are not, but that they help us to understand something that they in part are.'[1] And, above all, it is not in nature alone that he hears God's voice, but it is in contact between the human soul and nature that he perceives the nearness of the eternal. And the Being, of which the light of evening, sky and sea preach to Wordsworth, did not become the Infinite Existence of Pantheism, but had a personality akin to the poet's own. His growing devotion to the Church of England in middle life has perhaps its highest expression in 'Ecclesiastical Sonnets.' It is rather as a memorial of the ritual of past generations, as a historic monument both venerable and picturesque, that he is affected by the grey village churches and the rites of divine service. His own piety, in spite of all outward loyalty, got little nourishment from them. The sonnets 'reflect rather the dignity of the Anglican Church than the ardent piety with which our other poet-mystics, such as Herbert, Vaughan, and Crashaw, adorn the offices of worship.'[2] But even this, the opening of men's eyes to the aesthetic values which lie hidden in the forms and memorials of Christian cult, was pioneer work for the religious revival.

When in 1844 John Keble published the lectures which he in his quality of Professor of Poetry delivered in Oxford, 'on the healing power of poetry,'[3] he dedicated them to 'the true philosopher, the sacred bard William Wordsworth.'[4]

[1] Inge, *op. cit.* p. 309. [2] Inge, *op. cit.* p. 305.

[3] *De Poeticae Vi Medica. Praelectiones Academicae Oxonii habitae . . . a Joanne Keble* (Oxonii, MDCCCXLIV).

[4] 'Viro vere philosopho, et vati sacro, Gulielmo Wordsworth, cui illud munus tribuit Deus Opt. Max. ut, sive hominum affectus caneret, sive terrarum et caeli pulchritudinem, legentium animos semper ad sanctiora erigeret, semper a pauperum et simpliciorum partibus staret, atque adeo, labente saeculo, existeret non solum dulcissimae poeseos verum etiam divinae veritatis antistes.'

Some years before (1839), when Wordsworth received an honorary doctorate at Oxford, and it fell to Keble as Professor of Poetry to introduce him, he paid a warm tribute of homage to the admired bard.[1] But, as in the dedication, it is not only the tribute of a poet who pays his homage to a master of song, but an expression of the spiritual friendship, in which Keble felt himself to stand to the Cumberland mystic. It is known, too, that he reciprocated Keble's feelings, and regarded 'The Christian Year' with warm admiration.[2]

This book may rightly be said to form the connecting-link between Romanticism and the Oxford Movement. Newman jocosely called it *fons et origo mali*. It is only to a slight extent stamped with the hall-mark of Tractarianism; but it is the same deep religious feeling,[3] the same strong sense of the nearness and reality of the invisible, which speaks to us in Keble's poems, and later became the driving force in the Church offensive of the thirties. This is what makes 'The Christian Year' one of the classic works in the poetry of Christendom.

It first came out in 1827. If one counts some additions in the third edition of 1828, it had been composed in the nine years 1819–28. The years 1823–28 had been most fruitful, a period on the whole harmonious and happy, which the University teacher already well known spent in retirement in the country. During this time he had the stimulating society of the pupils who gathered round him at Southrop Parsonage, Hurrell Froude, Robert Wilberforce, and Isaac Williams, whose names were to go down to posterity with his own. The poems on each of the Sundays and Saints' Days of the Church's Year, which made up the collection, had at first been written without any thought of their being published. Moreover, the arrangement by the Church's Year only to a small extent dictated the choice of subjects. Only for festivals and special Church offices were the subjects laid down

[1] J. T. Coleridge, *A Memoir of the Rev. John Keble* (Oxford and London, 1869), vol. i. pp. 257 f.

[2] *Op. cit.* vol. i. pp. 17 f.

[3] 'A tone of religious feeling, deep and tender beyond what was common even in religious men in the author's day, perhaps in any day,' is the most prominent feature Professor J. C. Shairp finds in his characterisation of *The Christian Year* in *North British Review* of September 1866 (a most valuable estimate of Keble's religious poetry).

beforehand. The rest seems fitted into different Sundays pretty much according to choice; some poems only come in to fill a gap in the series. It was chiefly out of consideration for his aged father's wishes that Keble decided to publish the collection. The success of the work was a surprise both to the author and to his friends, but it shows how the time was ripe. Certainly the poetry of Wordsworth had in no small measure contributed to this. The kinship between him and Keble starts in this, that for both all nature becomes a sermon on God's love. 'The Christian Year' is rich in expressions of the mystic communion, the correspondence, between the message of the external world and the doctrines of revealed religion. Consciously or unconsciously this feeling was deepened in Keble by the influence of a work which from its publication onwards constantly influenced Anglican thought, Butler's 'Analogy of Religion.'[1] Creation proclaims God's love and forgiveness. The poet hears

> In the low chant of wakeful birds,
> In the deep weltering flood,
> In whispering leaves, these solemn words—
> 'God made us all for good.'

In Nature's chorus in praise of the Creator there is only one discord:

> Man only mars the sweet accord.[2]

When Keble tries to pick out the separate notes of the different instruments in the chorus, he often gives proof of

[1] Cp. W. Lock in introduction to *The Christian Year* ('Library of Devotion,' vol. xviii., 5th ed., London, 1912) and a writer in *Oxford Undergraduates' Journal*, June 2, 1869. Newman (*Apologia*, 1st ed., p. 78; 1903 ed., p. 18) gives us his idea of the relation of Keble's thoughts to Butler's philosophy. They have taught him the same two spiritual truths. 'The first of these was what may be called in a large sense of the word, the sacramental system; that is the doctrine that material phenomena are both types and instruments of real things unseen, that is a doctrine which embraces not only what Anglicans and Catholics believe about Sacraments properly so called, but also the Article of the Communion of Saints in its fulness, and the Mysteries of the Faith.' The other truth is Butler's doctrine of probability, which Newman finds deepened in Keble by probability being combined in his religious thought with the witness of faith and love, which, when directed at the object which can only possess probability to the reason, give the religious consciousness the assurance on which a conviction can be founded.

[2] Fourth Sunday after Trinity.

a really artistic conception of nature. A. P. Stanley testified that the poet's intuition made it possible for him faithfully to describe the Eastern background of Biblical scenes without ever having himself visited the Holy Land.

'The Christian Year' has little or nothing of ascetic withdrawal from the world. It is a rich and motley gallery, which the poet has brought under obedience to Christ. History speaks as well as nature. The snowdrop and the rosebud have their voices no less than mountains and sea. Not least is it the warmth and repose of home, the little things of everyday life, that the poet loves and to which he gives a tongue. Here also comparison with Wordsworth is obvious. The latter's famous ode 'Intimations of Immortality from Recollections of early Childhood' plainly influenced several of the poems directly.[1] In the face of the child God's presence is mirrored with a greater clearness than in the stars of twilight or in the dewy flowers of evening. Keble himself in his lectures as Professor of Poetry pointed with admiration to this poem.[2] Wordsworth's thought, that the child's soul brings with it its happy purity from pre-existence in the bosom of God, though of doubtful Christian quality, has been dear to many a Christian mystic.[3] That children were very near to his heart Keble showed later in 'Lyra Innocentium.' Love of innocence has also been pointed out as one of the leading motives in 'The Christian Year.'

But the mysticism of nature, which was central with Wordsworth, was with Keble only outworks. It was the faith he learnt at his mother's knee, deepened and strengthened by the daily teaching of his Church, to which he gave expression. 'The age brought enlargements from different quarters, but no sudden break. The powerful influence, direct and indirect, of his University, the revival of the age of chivalry in Scott's poetry, the depth of meditation in Wordsworth, all combined with his original faith, and

[1] Lock, *op. cit.* p. xiii.

[2] 'Atque hac ferme sententia extat summi hac memoria poetae nobilissimum carmen: nempe non aliam ab causam tangi pueritiae recordationem exquisita illa ac pervagata dulcedine, quam propter debilem quendam prioris aevi, Deique propioris sensum' (*Praelectiones Academicae: De Poeticae Vi Medica*, p. 789).

[3] Inge, *op. cit.* p. 313 note.

united with the general tendencies of the age to take him back to older days, where his fancy found freer play, his piety encountered severer and more self-denying virtues than modern life produces.'[1] In his preface Keble gives as the object of the work, to make the spirit of the Anglican Liturgy as it appears in the Book of Common Prayer, living to the men of his age, to help them to bring their thoughts and feelings into harmony with it, and above all, emphasises 'that soothing tendency' he finds in the Prayer Book. It is that same devotion to the Book of Common Prayer to which Alexander Knox gives expression, and which was long to be one of the most prominent features of Neo-Anglicanism in its early stage. A feature in Keble's piety, which has been pointed out as common to the later Tractarian religion, is a warm love of the Saviour as a personally near and ever-present friend.[2]

Among the poems on different subjects, chiefly occasional offices, which conclude the collection, there are two which give valuable contributions to the characterisation of their author. The one, 'King Charles the Martyr,' by its title shows how the tradition of the Caroline Restoration and the Non-Jurors lived on in country parsonages. The poem is one of the last, and it is as if one heard in it a harbinger of the sermon on 'National Apostasy,' with which Keble, six years later, was to give the signal for battle against what he regarded as the sacrileges of his day, when he speaks of this :

> True son of our dear Mother, early taught
> With her to worship and for her to die,
> Nursed in her aisles to more than kindly thought,
> Oft in her solemn hours we dream thee nigh.

And when the Church which produced King Charles, yearly 'offers her maternal tears,' she warns her sons :

> . . . like thee to His dear Feet to cling
> and bury in His Wounds our earthly fears.

[1] Shairp, *op. cit.* The poet of Christian home life looked up with reverence to the hermits and holy virgins of earlier days :

> 'The nearest Heaven on earth
> Who talk with God in shadowy glades
> Free from rude care and mirth.'

[2] W. Lock, *J. Keble, a Biography* (3rd ed., London, 1893), p. 69.

Another of these poems, 'Gunpowder Treason,' has in some copies under the title: 'addressed to converts from Popery.' It presents a picture of the Church sorrowing, as once on the day of the Crucifixion, over the errors of Rome, and the enforced division. In spite of its unreserved condemnation of the errors of Rome, the poem bears strong witness of a deep reverence for the Mother Church of the West, which is also to some extent a legacy of Caroline Anglicanism. The last verse is a warning:

Speak gently of our sister's fall:
Who knows but gentle love
May win her at our patient call
The surer way to prove?

The contrast between Newman's and Keble's earlier attitude towards Rome is brought out clearly when one sets against these lines Newman's unreserved confession in 'Apologia' that it was only late that he succeeded in getting rid of the prejudice against Rome which he owed to his Evangelical upbringing and to Newton's book on the Prophecies: even in 1843 'his imagination was strained' by his youthful conception of Rome as Anti-Christ. This at least partially explains the radical revolution in Newman's life, while Keble's attitude to Rome underwent hardly any perceptible change.[1]

It has already been stated that the success of 'The Christian Year' far surpassed the writer's expectations: during Keble's lifetime there were ninety-five editions, and fresh ones are constantly demanded. It has been said of it that it became 'a book for every man, found in every room, a companion in travel, a consoler in sickness, read again and again, received both by the

[1] 'Gunpowder Treason' contains the only verse in *The Christian Year* which Keble later found occasion to alter. He had at first written:

'O come to our Communion Feast:
There present, in the heart
*Not* in the hands, the eternal Priest
Will His true Self impart.

Since this was interpreted as implying a denial of the doctrine of the Real Presence, it was altered in 1866, after the poet's death, but by commission from him, to 'As in the hands' (W. Lock, *John Keble, a Biography*, p. 56). It is hard to believe that the alteration does not to some extent reflect a change of view under the influence of the sacramental teaching of Tractarianism, in spite of assertions to the contrary.

reason and the heart, calming, sustaining, teaching, purifying, uplifting. . . . No one saw its literary defects better than the author; it was of wisdom and not of pride or indifference that he abstained from the attempt to improve an inharmonious line or imperfect rhyme or the passages where his thought perhaps was somewhat obscurely expressed. Wordsworth's sharp poetic sense perceived such faults, yet the book was his delight. See how men like Mackenzie in the wilds of Africa and Robertson, during his thankless labours in Brighton, took the book to their hearts, and in it found a never-failing comfort through all their trials.'[1]

So Keble's little book has become the possession of all times more than any other of the literary productions of Neo-Anglicanism. It may still be recommended for study and meditation, though a certain obscurity in expression makes it not easily accessible. It interests us most because it presents to view the nuptials of Romanticism with genuine Anglican piety. Thus it was epoch-making for its age. We might be tempted here to point out how the romantic vein flows on in the poetry of the Anglican Renaissance, especially in 'Lyra Apostolica,' perhaps also in Isaac Williams, also how it contributed to mould a character like that of Hurrell Froude—but this would anticipate our presentation of the later stages of the movement.

[1] J. T. Coleridge, in a letter to the *Guardian*, April 1866.

## CHAPTER VI

### THE NOETICS—THE PROBLEM OF THE ESTABLISHMENT

When in April 1822 John Henry Newman, at twenty-one years of age, attained the highest object of his academic ambition, to be elected Fellow of Oriel College, this betokened the beginning of a new epoch in his life. At this time Oriel had intellectually an undisputed place of honour among the colleges of Oxford. From it had proceeded the proposal of a reorganisation of the examination system of the University, which produced a general uplifting after the decay of the eighteenth century;[1] it had also been the first to open its fellowships for general competition to the whole University. Newman was of Trinity College. So some of the acutest heads of the University met together in Oriel Common-Room. Among the men who came forward to congratulate their new *socius*, none could vie in celebrity with Keble. Newman relates how he was ready to sink into the floor when Keble came forward and took him by the hand.[2] But next year Keble exchanged his tutorship at Oriel for a country vicarage. It was other men and another spirit which affected the young student of Evangelical and Calvinistic upbringing. Those who set the tone in Oriel in the twenties were the so-called Noetics, an intellectual group of mildly liberal tendency who took up a critical attitude both towards the old High Church school and the more modern Evangelicalism.

[1] John Eveleigh, Provost of Oriel 1781–1814, had taken the lead in separating from the mass of examinees, who previously were all equally passed, those who 'examinatoribus maxime se commendaverunt.' Those were divided into three classes, and thus the system still prevailing was introduced. In 1820 Newman was only 'below the line.' Thus his election to a fellowship at Oriel was his rehabilitation both in his own and in others' eyes.

[2] *Letters*, vol. i. p. 72 (ed. 1903, p. 63).

Contributions to an estimate of the Noetics have been left by Mark Pattison, who, however, only came to Oriel in 1832. He points to their chief defect, the lack of historical training, which was to be bequeathed by them to the prevailing tendency of the thirties. 'It was only in the then condition of the University that the new Oriel school of the Noetics, as they came to be called, could be welcomed as a wholesome invasion of a scurfy pond, stagnant with sameness and custom. The Noetics knew nothing of the philosophical movement which was taking place on the Continent: they were imbued neither with Kant nor with Rousseau, yet this knot of Oriel men was distinctly the product of the French Revolution. They called everything in question; they appealed to first principles, and disallowed authority as a judge in intellectual matters. There was a wholesome intellectual ferment constantly maintained in the Oriel Common-Room.'[1]

So in effect were found here dispositions to a liberal Protestant theology within the English Church,[2] modest dispositions certainly, which were not likely to lead to important results in the near future, but to which one must trace back the theological growth which from and with the publication of 'Essays and Reviews' in 1860 was gradually to give to Anglican theology a wider and freer range of enquiry. The Noetics formed no school, were only a group of men who started from the same principles, but otherwise had varying views. We must now make acquaintance with the leading members of this older Oriel group, which by help or hindrance affected the Oriel school of the next decade. Copleston, Hawkins, Whately, Hampden, Arnold—all these names are intimately connected with the rise and course of the Oxford Movement.

When Newman entered Oriel, Edward Copleston was its head (Provost, 1814–28).[3] From him in large measure the

[1] Mark Pattison, *Memoirs* (London, 1885), pp. 78 f.

[2] Cp. J. B. Mozley, *Essays, Historical and Theological* (London, 1878), vol. ii. p. 27: 'There was every look of a rising school, that had its career to come, and a whole chain of youthful anticipations to run through.'

[3] For the following see generally Overton, *The English Church in the Nineteenth Century*, pp. 117 f.; Storr, *The Development of English Theology* (London, 1913), pp. 94–110; Tuckwell, *Pre-Tractarian Oxford, a Reminiscence of the Oriel Noetics* (London, 1919). More amusing than valuable is T. Mozley, *Reminiscences* (1882), vol. i. ch. 3 ('The Old Oriel School').

younger men, who were to take up his mantle, gathered their inspiration. It was he who, by his logical outlines, schooled their thought to the chilly clarity which was its distinguishing mark. In the *Edinburgh Review* he broke a lance in defence of the historical position of Aristotle in the curriculum of the English Universities. When he became Provost of Oriel, Copleston, according to his own account, was more of a High Churchman than those who were so called in Oxford, and in his views on Church and Church polity he was quite conservative. The Church was to him a society of divine institution, outwardly visible and universal, whose officials traced their origin from the Apostles, bound to them by a long chain of historical succession, and he maintained the Apostolicity and Catholicity of the English Church. But at the same time this Apostolic Succession was something quite different from what was to be taught later in 'Tracts for the Times.' Copleston definitely rejects any sacramental character as bestowed by this historical connection. He will not hear of any 'sacrificial prerogative' or of any transference of qualities from one person to another.

Witnesses agree in assigning to Copleston the spiritual primacy among the Noetics. When in 1828 he left his post at Oriel for the Bishopric of Llandaff, he was succeeded by a man of less originality, but whose firmness of character made it possible for him to maintain the course he took up through all the Tractarian storms that passed over the College and University in his day. It is a peculiar irony of destiny that Newman should have himself supported the election of Edward Hawkins instead of Keble, who was the rival candidate, although he withdrew, and thus should have helped to give one of his most serious opponents during the following years the authoritative position in the academic world of Oxford which the headship of a College alone could give.[1] This was still in Newman's 'liberal' period, the close of which he himself dates about this time.[2]

[1] Newman develops his reasons in a letter to Keble of December 19, 1827 (*Letters and Correspondence*, vol. i. pp. 174 f.; ed. 1903, pp. 152 f.); he says that during close contact with Hawkins he found that his general mode of thought and religious views most closely agreed with his own.

[2] *Apologia* (1st ed.), p. 72 (ed. 1908, p. 14); cp. Burgon, *Lives of Twelve Good Men* (new ed., London, 1891), pp. 206 ff. Here is the fullest treatment of Hawkins (the Great Provost).

Keble and he were still comparative strangers, while Hawkins during the last years had been an essential factor in his development: 'It was he who first taught me to weigh my words, and to be cautious in my statements. He led me to that mode of limiting and clearing my sense in discussion and in controversy, and of distinguishing between cognate ideas, and of obviating mistakes by anticipation, which to my surprise has been since considered, even in quarters friendly to me, to savour of the polemics of Rome. He is a man of most exact mind himself, and he used to snub me severely on reading, as he was kind enough to do, the first sermons that I wrote, and other compositions which I was engaged upon.'[1] Further, Newman ascribes to Hawkins a decisive influence upon his theological development. It was he who put in his hands Archbishop Sumner's 'Treatise on Apostolical Preaching,' which cured Newman of the Calvinism he still retained—one may have reason to ask oneself if the Calvinistic stamp ever completely disappeared from his religion[2]—and taught him to believe in 'baptismal regeneration,' one of the watchwords in the coming controversy. A principle which was to be fundamental for his coming 'Catholicism' Newman also ascribes to Hawkins' direct influence, the doctrine of Tradition. As a young student he heard Hawkins preach on this subject in 1818.[3] It was only later that he appropriated this thought, which he later reproduces as follows: 'He lays down a proposition, self-evident, as soon as stated, to those who have at all examined the structure of Scripture, viz., that the sacred text was never intended to teach doctrine but only to prove it, and that if we would learn doctrine we must have recourse to the formularies of the Church, *e.g.*, to the Catechism and to the Creeds. He considers that, after learning from them the doctrines of Christianity, the inquirer must verify them by Scripture.' This view combines a

[1] *Apologia*, p. 65 (ed. 1908, p. 9).

[2] Newman himself later named the doctrine of Predestination as one of the elements in his youthful creed which he never let go (*Letters and Correspondence*, vol. i. p. 125; ed. 1903, p. 110).

[3] This sermon was published in extended form as *A Dissertation upon the Use and Importance of Unauthoritative Tradition* (Oxford, 1819). In his view of the value of tradition in relation to Scripture he reminds us of Jebb in his *Appendix*, but Hawkins seems to value tradition as a source of knowledge more highly than Jebb.

healthy reaction against the exaggerations of Biblicism with a scholasticism which is in the sharpest opposition to all historical thought. Newman's view is that it was this conception that finally freed him from Evangelicalism,[1] and it dominated the first stage of Neo-Anglicanism. During the whole Tractarian storm, Hawkins retained a moderate High Church standpoint, similar to that of Jebb. Maintaining the historical importance of the Apostolic Succession, he was never weary of showing up the absurd consequences of the theoretic superstructure which Newman and his allies erected on this foundation.[2]

The Noetic circle was not without an exotic strain. This was supplied by Blanco White, at one time a Spanish priest, who, after having fallen into doubt as to the doctrine of his Church, left his native land in the critical year 1809 and migrated to England, where he added to his Spanish name its English equivalent. Here he joined and was received into the Anglican Church, and after varying fortunes and literary occupations found a refuge in Oriel, to which College from 1826 to 1831 he was attached. The University gave him the degree of Master of Arts *honoris causa*, and this enabled him to become a member of Oriel Common-Room, without being Fellow. It was only an accidental resting-point in his unquiet life, the inner history of which, described by himself in letters and autobiographic accounts,[3] has a tragic romance, only comparable with a life the development of which went in the diametrically opposite direction, that of Newman. During his Oriel years these two were in close intimacy, and White, like the leading Noetics, influenced his young friend in a

[1] Perhaps this is the simplest rendering of 'the principle on which the Bible Society was set up' (*Apologia*, p. 66; ed. 1908, p. 10).

[2] Most clearly set forth in a sermon on *The Apostolic Succession* of the year 1842. Here he points out the uncertainty which must always adhere to the proof of an unbroken succession, and adds: 'It is no act of Christian Faith to believe a point of Ecclesiastical History which cannot be proved.' The validity of the administration of the Sacrament rests on Christ's promise alone, and not on any form of Church government. Hawkins quotes finally expressions of the Caroline theologians, in which divine right is certainly assigned to the office of Bishop, but no monopoly of the means of grace.

[3] *The Life of the Rev. Joseph Blanco White, written by himself, with Portions of his Correspondence*, edited by J. H. Thorn, vols i.–iii. (London, 1845). Gladstone treated Blanco White's life and development in an interesting study in *Gleanings of Past Years*, vol. ii. (London, 1879).

strongly anti-Roman sense, but at the same time gave him a knowledge of Roman Catholic ritual and piety, which was destined to have its as yet unsuspected importance.[1] But White seems to have been in the closest relations with the man he himself calls a 'prominent leader of all liberal spirits in Oxford,' Richard Whately, the most central and vigorous personality among the Noetics.[2]

Whately [3] was a man of mathematical and logical training, who in characteristic combination united a ready dialectic with a very scanty ballast of historical training and reading. His talent was marked by a robust vigour, softened by a playful humour, which gives his portrait a warm and full-blooded humanity, and appears also in his literary productions, especially his classical travesty of Hume's method, 'Historic Doubts respecting Napoleon Buonaparte.' As academic teacher, his importance lay most in the logical training he imparted, which gave its stamp to the intellectual life of Oxford in the twenties. Pattison in his 'Memoirs' points out how Whately's logic, 'or some form of Nominalism,' dominated instruction at the time of the liberal wave, about 1830. 'But when Tractarianism had made the clergy aware of their own strength, and high sacerdotal doctrines were openly proclaimed, we fell off from Whately, and vague, indefinite, realistic views under the influence of Coleridge and Sir William Hamilton slowly occupied the schools.'[4] But an abiding importance was retained by the logical element represented by Whately: it was this which trained Newman, and gave his genius the scholastic anti-historical stamp which was finally to settle his life's destiny. Newman's intimacy with Whately dates from 1825, when he became his lieutenant as Vice-Principal

[1] *Op. cit.* vol. i. p. 409: 'Pusey, Wilberforce, and Froude came in the evening to learn the order of the R.C. service of the Breviary.'

[2] When in 1831 Whately left Oxford to be Archbishop of Dublin, White followed him there. But his spiritual development continued in a sceptical and negative direction. He ended his days as member of a Unitarian congregation in Liverpool in 1841. The breach with old friends, especially Newman, caused deep wounds to his warm and sensitive nature.

[3] For Whately see *Life and Correspondence of Richard Whately*, by E. Jane Whately (London, 1866), and an excellent sketch by J. Tulloch, *Movements of Religious Thought in Britain during the Nineteenth Century* (London, 1885), pp. 46–53, perhaps the best work on the theological history of the earlier nineteenth century in England, now unfortunately long out of print.

[4] *Memoir*, p. 166.

of St. Alban's Hall, a smaller College now absorbed in Merton, of which Whately was Principal.[1] Newman had found favour with Whately as a good listener, such as so talkative a man required. During walks and rides he made the shy and retiring young student the object of his well-meant if somewhat hard-handed spiritual counsel, and shortly found himself rewarded for his care. He soon saw in Newman 'the clearest head he knew.' Whately's warm cordiality drew the young friend out of the loneliness in which he had found himself at his entry into Oriel. He had the quality, not uncommon in a nature exuberantly happy in friendship, of seeing all his protégés in a transfigured light: 'all Whately's geese were swans.' During this period of their acquaintance he lent Newman the manuscript of his never printed 'Analytical Dialogues,' which Newman copied. He made use of him also to help in the production of his 'Handbook to Logic,' and when this was published some years afterwards, in the preface he acknowledged without reserve Newman's share in the work. The latter was very grateful for this, and it gave rise to an outburst of sincere gratitude: 'Much as I owe to Oriel in the way of mental improvement, to none as I think do I owe so much as to you. I know who it was that first gave me heart to look about me after my election (as Fellow), and taught me to think correctly, and—strange office for an instructor—to rely on myself.'[2] Even fifteen years after he left the Church of England, Newman, in a note on this letter, witnessed to his feelings of devotion for this his spiritual benefactor, and remembered his youthful design of dedicating a book to Whately, 'who by teaching me to think, taught me to differ from himself.'[3] Therein lies a correct estimate of that in which his debt consisted. Whately was not free from the self-sufficiency which dialectic readiness too easily gives, when it lacks counterpoise in the shape of familiarity with the

[1] *Apologia*, p. 68 (ed. 1908, p. 11). Newman gave up this post the following year, when he became Tutor at Oriel, and thus had definite duties of instruction there.

[2] *Letters and Correspondence*, vol. i. p. 107, November 14, 1826 (ed. 1903, p. 124).

[3] *Ibid.*, vol. i. p. 141 (ed. 1903, p. 124). Newman's later development naturally caused Whately much pain, just as Newman was not without feeling for his judgment. The relation to Whately is one of the more painful sides of Newman's later history.

infinite requirements and tasks of actual enquiry. He talked of High and Low Church as Sadducees and Pharisees, and dealt his blows to both sides equally. All sacerdotalism was hateful to him, but at the same time, at least in his earlier years, he maintained a conception of the Church which Newman admits to have contributed to impress upon him 'the anti-Erastian conception of Church policy, which was one of the most prominent features of the Tractarian Movement.' This his conception of the Church Whately put out anonymously in 1826 in the book 'Letters on the Church by an Episcopalian,' the authorship of which was soon discovered, and can be regarded as beyond all doubt. Even to-day it makes a powerful impression by the cogency of its argument and the clearness of its style. Its importance for the development of Neo-Anglican thought about the Church would be evident, even if we had not Newman's definite statement on the point.

The author starts with a distinction between the Churches of the old and the new covenant. In the old the spiritual and secular societies are one and the same: in the new each has its separate province, and every interference, whether of the spiritual with the secular or *vice versa*, conflicts with the nature of the new covenant. Christians in all times have sinned against this. From this he passes on to define his conception of the Church. The Church is not merely a collective appellation for all who came to agree in certain opinions: it is a society or 'body-corporate' of divine institution in which all individual Christians are members, and there stand in a certain relation to each other and to their Head, Christ. The Church has a definite authority in things that relate to outward order, and has to formulate Articles of Belief out of Scripture as a corrective—here the author himself points out kinship with Hawkins' view of tradition. The pith of the book is the relation of Church to State. Here Warburton's theory of alliance is sharply criticised. The only advantage connection with the State brings to the Church is protection from external violence, and this it is the duty of the State under all circumstances to afford to a religious society. Now it is actually the King who ordains bishops, that is, decides who are to be ordained. The protection of

the State is forcibly compared with the collar of the fat dog in the fable, which provoked the sarcastic observation of the lean wolf. Though wrong in principle, the actual relation must in the meantime be recognised, but it in no way justifies contemptuous talk of priests as paid by the State. This only administers the property of the Church. The question of its origin has only an antiquarian value; the Church's right to it is based on actual possession, and this right in respect to land and tithes is of the same kind as the right of all other institutions, schools, hospitals, etc., to the endowments they have acquired in the course of ages. A certain authority of control must be allowed to the State, which, with compensation to the individuals who happen to enjoy the endowments in question, may confiscate property belonging to institutions whose uselessness is evident. But this right must only be exercised with the greatest caution. The book ends with a strong appeal for Disestablishment, but as appears from what has been quoted, without Disendowment. It would be for the good of the State, which would afterwards in the independent Church find a more powerful ally in the maintenance of law and order, than in the Church tied and bound, and at the same time win the loyalty of Dissenters. The Church would gain in purity of Faith, and through the capacity for reforming itself which it would receive. 'As fellow-citizens we therefore desire of the Government only the protection which it is bound to give to all classes. As Church we desire nothing of the State except to be left in peace.'

One may ask oneself if the validity of this reasoning is limited to England of 1820–30, or if it has not a certain applicability to other countries, which are faced by a crisis like to that which threatened in this case. But one must also ask, whether abstract right ever has any importance in the game of practical politics; and one cannot be blind to the fact that Whately overlooked the strongest argument at all times for a State-Church, the responsibility it gives the Church, and the recognition on the part of the State which it implies of the place of religion in all higher common life, without which recognition the ideal of the State must become one-sided and perverted. If one is right in seeing, as some do, in the Neo-Anglican conception of the

relation between State and Church, a development of the Puritan, Whately's book marks a milestone on the way, which led further away from the old Anglicanism of which we found the classic expression in Hooker.[1] We shall now see how a spirit akin to Whately, starting from much the same premisses, as regards general religious conceptions, but with a richer temperament, greater historical insight, and a deeper social and political passion—how Thomas Arnold arrived at an exactly opposite solution of the problem of State and Church.

Few men outside its own course have for the critical history of the Oxford Movement an importance comparable to that of Arnold who, brought up in chiefly the same surroundings, became the exact opposite of Tractarianism in the thirties, embodying all that it lacked and avoided: historical conception, theological and political liberalism, Erastianism.[2] And besides Newman's own development, I know of no more tragic episode in English Church history of the thirties than the mutual blindness which made Newman, in the exasperation of an unlucky moment, ask: 'Is Arnold a Christian?'[3] and which caused Arnold to make an attack, most unintelligent and unjust in its vehement violence, upon the men who nevertheless along with him had the commission entrusted to them of making Christianity a living force in their generation.

Arnold's life can here only be briefly sketched.[4] In 1811, at the age of sixteen, he entered Corpus Christi College, to which Keble also then belonged. The bond of friendship then entered into between them was never entirely broken, in spite of the strongest temptation. In 1815 he became Fellow of Oriel, and thus came in contact with the Noetic circle. He was most strongly influenced by Whately,

[1] See above, p. 3.

[2] In English literature Erastianism is the usual term for a strictly State-Church view. The term is derived from the Swiss doctor, Thomas Lüber, *alias* Erastus, in the sixteenth century; but its usual application does not do justice to the ideas of this man. See J. N. Figgis, 'Erastus and Erastianism,' *Journal of Theological Studies* (London, 1901), vol. ii. pp. 66–101.

[3] *Apologia* (ed. 1908), pp. 33 f.; *Letters and Correspondence*, vol. ii. p. 47 (ed. 1908, vol. ii. p. 42).

[4] The chief source for Arnold's life is A. P. Stanley's classical biography, *Life and Correspondence of Thomas Arnold* (1st ed., 1844).

who became his life-long friend. After four years he left the University, married, and spent some happy years giving private tuition at Laleham-on-Thames. The year 1827 brought a great change in his life; he became Head-master of Rugby School, which through his influence was raised to the first rank of England's public schools, and remained so for the rest of his life.[1] It is not here the place to describe his activity at Rugby, which was epoch-making in the history of higher education. The portrait of the great head-master, seen with the eyes of an admiring pupil, has by 'Tom Brown's Schooldays' become familiar to many readers even outside England. School-work was Arnold's proper atmosphere. His exuberant vitality, warm heart, and natural vigour made him the feared and beloved idol of his pupils. Then, too, the strong ethical passion, which proceeded from a real but cheerful religious temper, showed itself abundantly in an unwearied battle with evil in all the forms in which it encounters and defiles young minds. In his poem 'Rugby Chapel,' Matthew Arnold has drawn the portrait of the unwearied and manly witness, which proceeded from the pulpit of the school chapel, and the Rugby sermons form the chief part of Arnold's not very extensive literary production. Arnold was a sincere and happy man; his happiness was a part of his religion. It is doubtless a correct observation, when a theologian of the Tractarian School[2] describes Arnold as Lutheran. 'Arnold was German, his ἦθος was that of true religious Germanism, and his life is a particularly attractive, but also a genuine sample and a legitimate development of the Lutheran theory—not the Lutheran theory with him, perhaps, as much as the true Lutheran instinct which led to the same point.'

Decisive for Arnold's theological development was a quality which he shared with few in his generation in England: he was a historian. Acquaintance with Niebuhr had opened new vistas for him in ancient history, his proper field. But the critical training it gave him, and continued

[1] Arnold stayed at Rugby till his early death in 1842. The year before that he had been appointed Regius Professor of Modern History at Oxford.

[2] J. B. Mozley, *Essays Historical and Theological* (London, 1878), vol. ii. pp. 25 f. The essay on Arnold was written in 1842, the year before his death.

acquaintance with German science, led him in theology too into deeper waters than perhaps anyone of his contemporaries in England had ventured to try. Probably he scarcely guessed the consequences of critical work in the region of Biblical enquiry, but his deep religious sense was united with a really liberal receptivity for the new contributions the age had to give to the interpretation of revelation. Arnold did not live to perform what his beginnings promised. His pupil and biographer, Stanley, was his heir in this respect. That it was the historical sense which especially distinguished him from Whately has been already pointed out. In common with him he had the idea of the universal priesthood, and a deeply rooted dislike of all sacerdotalism.

These were the chief starting-points of his views on the nature of the Church. It was through his pamphlet 'Principles of Church Reform' in 1833 that he first seriously caused controversy about his name, and introduced a fresh ferment into a situation of ecclesiastical politics which seemed already sufficiently disturbed. In a 'Postscript' the same year he made more explicit his fundamental ideas.

What induced Arnold to put out his project of reform was a conviction that the days of the English Church were numbered, if a radical change did not take place. And he cannot conceive a worse fate, not merely for the Church, but especially for the State, than that the two should part company. It would mean that England no longer remained a Christian nation. And 'in such a state the establishment of Paganism would be an absolute blessing: anything would be better than a national society, framed for no higher than physical ends, to enable men to eat, drink, and live luxuriously, acknowledging no power greater than its own, and by consequence no law higher than its own municipal enactments. Let a few generations pass over in such a state, and the missionary who should preach the worship of Ceres, or set up an oracle of Apollo, or teach the people to kindle the eternal fire of Vesta upon the common altar hearth of their country, would be to that depraved society as life from the dead.'[1] Arnold's idea of the relation of Church and State is the same as we have already found in Hooker: the State and the Church are

[1] *Principles*, p. 70.

fundamentally identical. 'The religious society is only civil society fully enlightened; the State in its highest perfection becomes the Church.'[1] Seen from this point of view, the religious division becomes doubly tragic. The only way Arnold sees of removing this is comprehension: 'The different tribes should act together as it were in one army, yet each should retain the arms and manner of fighting with which habit has made them most familiar.'[2] It is a question of avoiding the mistakes of our forefathers, who, urged on by the desire of unity, only sought it in a forced uniformity both in matter of worship and expression of faith. The attempt to find an authority in the Apostles' Creed and the unanimous view of the early Church had been in vain. Anglicans and Dissenters had been equally one-sided. Now they had at last come to be more hostile to each other than to evil. Must one not try another system? 'To constitute a Church thoroughly national, thoroughly united, thoroughly Christian, which should allow great varieties of opinion and of ceremonies and forms of worship, according to the habits and tempers of its members.'[3] The different religious bodies had everything essential in common. Here Arnold formulates a creed of his own, which covers the first and second articles of the Apostles' Creed, but in the place of the third has merely a definition of Holy Scripture as the document of revelation. On this ground all could be united, except Roman Catholics, Quakers, and Unitarians.[4] His meaning is that the vault of the national Church should be thrown over the religious medley which is contained within the limits of the country. The episcopal organisation is retained, and all ministers of the Church are to be episcopally ordained. But at the same time Arnold takes the field against

[1] *Postscript*, p. 19. [2] Preface, p. iv. [3] *Principles*, p. 28.

[4] In the question of Unitarians Arnold seems to have been doubtful: he makes a distinction between different classes of them. Some were real Christians, though they could not accept the Athanasian Creed. No one who will pray to Christ as Lord should be rejected. He expresses this point in *Postscript*, p. 10: 'If a man will not let me pray to and praise my Saviour, he destroys the exercise of my faith altogether; but I am in no way injured by his praying to him as a glorified man, while I pray to Him as God.' Of the Roman Catholics in England he says: 'If they only could become convinced that a universal empire is as impossible in the religious as in the secular sphere, and that no society can have a wider extent than the political society to which every man by birth belongs, they would know that by nature they belonged to the Church of England, not the Church of middle Italy.'

the most baseless of errors, 'confusion of the Christian ministry with priesthood, which gave rise to the idea that anything can be lawful for a Christian layman, which is unlawful for a Christian minister.'[1] On the basis of the principle of the universal priesthood considerable alterations are demanded in the organisation of the Church by the concession of a great place in the care of the parish to the lay-element. The government of dioceses should become constitutional by a council set beside the Bishop, and election to priestly functions should in certain cases be introduced. A radical division of dioceses should take place. The most difficult question must, however, be: Is it possible to unite in one Church such great differences of divine service as would be a consequence of the comprehension? Arnold solves the question by discounting the requirement of a single type of service. The liturgy of the English Church should be used each Sunday and Saint's Day, but at other times great freedom should be permitted. The Parish Church should be opened for other types of service on Sunday afternoons and weekdays, calculated to answer to different tastes and degrees of culture with different feelings: 'He who condemns such a feeling, . . . he can but ill appreciate one great attribute of God's works, the endless variety. . . . The morning song of the lark is not the same as the evening song of the nightingale.'[2] But all services must be held in the Parish Church. Its venerable walls should no longer need

[1] *Principles*, p. 62. In *Postscript* the same thought, more strongly emphasised, recurs. The obstacle to recognising the agreement of Church and State consists in ascribing to Christianity an office which it does not recognise upon earth, that of the priesthood. 'If such is found which derives its authority from God Himself, tension immediately arises between the civil and religious communities. In connection with this the character of episcopal ordination is defined in opposition to the doctrine of "successio apostolica"' (p. 15). 'Now, if any gift be thus transmitted in the case of Episcopacy, what is it, and where is the proof of its existence? When men say that the power of ordaining ministers is thus transmitted, there is a confusion in the use of the word power. Bishops confer a legal qualification for the ministry, not a real one, whether natural or supernatural. They can give neither piety, nor wisdom, nor learning, nor eloquence: nothing, in short, but what the laws or constitutions of the Church of God empower them to give, that is to say, a commission to preach and administer the sacraments in the Church of God according to the measure of the gifts which the person ordained has received, or may receive hereafter, not from them, or through their medium, but from God, and the blessing of the Holy Spirit on his own prayers and exertions.'

[2] *Principles*, p. 67.

to call forth thoughts of division and sectarian bitterness. Arnold is not blind to the fact that a revision of the Church's confession may become necessary. But in such a case it must on no account be undertaken by priests alone. 'Laymen have no right to shift from their own shoulders an important part of Christian responsibility, and as no educated layman individually is justified in taking his faith upon trust from a clergyman, so neither are the laity as a body warranted in taking the national faith in the same way.' It might become necessary to find more general expressions and give up formulae which rest upon old controversies.

Not many years passed before Arnold himself had to recognise the chimerical nature of this project of Church reform. It had been evoked under the impression that the Church was in imminent danger. It came out certainly a hundred years too soon. But it is noticeable to what a degree it anticipated the projects for the reunion of English Christianity which have seen the light in our own day. And certainly seldom has a more unprejudiced view been expressed in his Church. Both in their strength and their weakness Arnold's thoughts stand in such direct opposition to those produced by Tractarianism, that these can scarcely be seen in their right light, if they are not compared with what was proclaimed *ex cathedra Rugbeiensi*. In two points we must agree, it seems, with the Oxford men. With all their one-sidedness they knew that Christianity lost its justification for existence if it was robbed of its irrational depths. Arnold's Church at times looks like a suspiciously Utilitarian institution.[1] Nor did he see the dangers of a religious nationalism: that the Church, in spite of its divisions, has a common organic life and a connection through the ages was hidden from him. His conception of the Church looks narrow and one-sided, and is so, if it is compared with that of Whately or Coleridge. It was this thought, neglected by Arnold, which it was the historical task of the Oxford men to maintain; and so Arnold became their natural opponent. He never did more than

[1] The Church was instituted (*Postscript*, p. 18) 'for the production of man's highest possible perfection and happiness. It did not neglect even his physical wants and sufferings—but its main object was to improve him morally and spiritually;—to bring him to such a state of goodness and wisdom that his highest happiness would be no longer an unattainable dream.'

begin his life's work. At his death he left behind him fragmentary beginnings of a great work on Christian Politics.[1]

Another of the circle of Noetics must also be named, Renn Dickson Hampden. But though his chief work belongs to an earlier period, he attracted special attention by the decisive step in the history of Tractarianism which is associated with his name. When in 1832 he delivered his Bampton Lectures on *The Scholastic Philosophy considered in its Relation to Christian Theology*, they attracted no special attention. And yet Newman was right, when he found in them later a spirit which was irreconcilable with the dogmatism which was the backbone of his own religion and which he wanted to maintain in his Church. Though somewhat obscurely expressed, Hampden's Lectures are a noticeable attempt to distinguish the essential content of Scripture from the speculations which the Church at various times has raised to the rank of dogmas. His watchword was: back from tradition to Scripture, thus a quite advanced position in comparison with that of, *e.g.*, Hawkins.[2]

Freer thought, modest beginnings of which can be perceived in the older Oriel School, did not bear fruit for a long time. But it did not die out, and was not entirely stifled by the clerical reaction. Arnold's influence survived in his pupils. We have already mentioned Stanley as the most prominent of them. In 1825 a young Cambridge scholar, Thirlwall, produced Schleiermacher in English dress.[3] Together with Julius Hare he was in the coming generation one of the pioneers of Biblical Criticism. He was Bishop of St. David's for 34 years (*d.* 1875). In the sphere of the Old Testament it was reserved for Milman in his 'History of the Jews' (1829) to cause general offence by a mild attempt to find a natural explanation for accounts like that of the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrha. He is best known by his later gigantic work, 'History of Latin Christianity.' All these men paved the way in their measure for the decisive change of the sixties. Some of them, like Hampden and Thirlwall, lived long enough to condemn the consequences of their own life's work.

[1] This, in some respects the ripest product of his thought, was posthumously published in 1845 under the title *Fragments on Church and State*. Here also is found his fullest criticism of Tractarianism.

[2] Storr, *op. cit.*, pp. 99–106.

[3] *A Critical Essay on the Gospel of St. Luke*; cp. Storr, pp. 110 f., 186.

## CHAPTER VII

### THE FULNESS OF TIME

At the beginning of the thirties may be traced everywhere within Church circles an unrest as before a coming catastrophe. This was what caused Arnold to put out his project of reform, and it is echoed in most of the contemporary accounts. It was the great wave of Liberal reform, which was awaited with trepidation as soon to come rolling against the Church's ancient walls. Both in the view of contemporaries and in later historians one cannot help noticing a weakness for passing the same judgment upon different movements. There is no doubt that in the twenties strong anti-Church forces were at work. It was the swell of the French Revolution, which reached the coasts of England, and the most influential school of thought at the time was that of Utilitarian Radicalism, which is a direct continuation of the revolutionary thought of the French 'éclaircissement.' The maxim of 'the greatest happiness for the greatest number' was the watchword; Bentham, James and John Stuart Mill were the leaders. The chief organ of the school was the *Westminster Review*, which was owned by Bentham and preached Utilitarian Ethics and social reforms. That the Church system was also criticised cannot be surprising; but they abstained from openly combating Christianity itself. But J. S. Mill has himself borne witness that after the aristocracy his father abominated nothing so much as the Established Church. The Utilitarian ideas caught on in wide circles through the efforts for popular education which marked the age, the organs of which were the Mechanics' Institutes springing up in the industrial centres and the dissemination of handbooks of popular science through the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge.

It was the strength of philosophic Radicalism that it could make itself the advocate of the social reforms which the industrial and economic transformation of English society made necessary and which were menacingly demanded by an ever-growing proletariate, religious toleration, extended franchise, and a new Poor Law. The great danger of the Church now, as often before, was in the fact that it was incapable of seeing what social justice required, blind to the Christian side of reform-agitation, and instead clung fast to an order of society which belonged to the past. Clerical sympathies were now, as usually, with the Tories, and it was now unfortunate that the long Tory rule had created a bench of bishops of equally one-sided colour. Therefore when conservative statesmen at the end of the twenties were obliged to carry out some of the most vociferously demanded reforms, nothing was seen in this but a sample of the spirit hostile to Church and religion, which was to be fought at every point. The Churchmen who, like Arnold, had a more liberal conception must have seen a far more real danger in the blindness of their brethren. In the abolition of the Test and Corporation Acts they saw only the beginning of a general attack.

It is impossible for us to share the horror, felt in Church circles at the time, at the idea of offices of State ceasing to be reserved for members of the Anglican Church or those who by 'occasional conformity' satisfied the requirement of communion at her altars.[1] It seems to us a simple act of justice. But at the same time we must not overlook the fact that the change had the most serious consequences for the constitution of the Church. Hitherto it had been possible to justify the supremacy of Parliament over the Church by the fact that it formed a kind of lay-synod. Now the supposed harmony of Church and State had disappeared, and this was obvious to all. This gave rise to a problem which became ever more serious for the Church, till finally in quite recent times it received at any rate a partial solution. When in 1919 a Church constitution was carried which, as condition of a vote for the Church Assembly,

[1] Actual equality was still far from existing, as long as the chief places of education in the country, the old Universities, were reserved for those who could give satisfactory guarantees of their loyalty to the doctrine and ordinances of the Church.

requires a statement of the party that he does not belong to any religious body which is not in communion with the Church of England, thereby for the first time a definite line has been drawn which divides fellow-citizens within and without the national Church. This is the point which contemporary adherents of the old ideal, derived from Hooker, of the identity of the Church with the nation, vigorously attempted to combat. But in effect the recent reform was only a consequence, and in the interest of the free life of the Church a necessary consequence, of the reforms of 1828 and 1829. It was these that banished Hooker's Church ideal for ever to the fairy regions of the theoretic ideal, and gave a new actuality to the Puritan conception of the Church, though in a new form.[1] Even when the Test and Corporation Acts were abolished, they had already for a century been partly made inoperative, since every year an indemnity bill freed Dissenters from the consequences of breaking these laws.

In 1829 Catholic Emancipation followed. This, like the liberation of Dissenters, was carried through by the Tory Government under the Duke of Wellington, who came to power in 1828. But it was Sir Robert Peel, in his quality of Leader of the Lower House, who chiefly brought about the victory of the cause. Now Peel was Member for Oxford University, the chief stronghold of intransigent Anglicanism. His 'falling away' led to an embittered bye-election in the learned body, when Peel loyally resigned his seat, and his supporters tried to secure his re-election. We cannot dwell at length on this episode, which forms a milestone in Newman's life. It was the first time he openly abandoned his old associates, Whately among them, and together with Keble and Froude took a prominent part in the agitation against Peel, while Pusey voted with the Liberals. The result was that Sir Robert Inglis, one of the chief opponents of the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts, was chosen in Peel's place. This episode made Oxford the object of unflattering attention, and

[1] Cp. Morley, *Life of Gladstone*, vol. i. p. 114.—In the good old times Anglican Churchmen loved the royal supremacy. But when this became 'only a mask for the power of Parliament and so a tool for the hated "liberalism," then the Anglican became as convinced as the Puritan of the superiority of Independency.' So says a Nonconformist critic, A. M. Fairbairn, *Catholicism, Roman and Anglican* (London, 1899), p. 308.

there is no doubt that in Parliament it considerably increased the dislike of the Church and her supporters.[1]

The new elections in 1830 after the death of George IV were under the influence of the July Revolution, and after almost fifty years of Tory Government England got a Whig Ministry under Grey. Grey's name is connected with the Reform Bill of 1832, which abolished the most crying injustices in the franchise. But it was not a radical step, but rather an aristocratic Whig attempt to check revolutionary designs by moderate concessions,[2] and it satisfied neither the working-classes nor the philosophic radicals. The Bishops in the House of Lords had mostly voted against Reform, and the clergy throughout the country had done their best to hinder it.[3]

In the hostility of the clergy to Reform one must seek the real cause of the violent anti-clerical wave which went through the country. Blomfield, Bishop of London, one of the most important men on the Bench, had in 1831, when the Reform Bill was for the first time before Parliament, not voted against it but intentionally abstained, in order not to go against the other bishops, if he voted according to his conscience. But this was enough to create such a bitter feeling against him in the diocese, that when he was to preach soon afterwards in a London church, the parishioners declared they would walk out of the church in a body if the Bishop mounted the pulpit, and so the Bishop abstained from preaching.[4] The Bishop of Bristol's Palace was burnt down, and in the streets of Canterbury

[1] *The Greville Memoirs: A Journal of the Reigns of King George IV and King William IV*, by the late Charles C. F. Greville, Esq. (ed. by Henry Reeve, vols. i.–iii., London, 1874) say with regard to the Catholic Emancipation Bill (vol. i. pp. 184 f) : ' It is remarkable that attacks, I will not say upon the Church, but upon Churchmen, are now made in both Houses with much approbation. The Oxford parsons have behaved so abominably at the election that they have laid themselves open to the severest strictures, and last night Lord Wharncliffe in our House and Murray in the other commented on the general conduct of Churchmen at this crisis with great severity, which was by no means displeasing except to the Bishops. I am convinced that very few years will elapse before the Church will really be in danger. People will grow tired of paying so dearly for so bad an article.'

[2] Marriott, *England since Waterloo* (vol. vii. of *A History of England*, ed. by C. Oman ; London, 1913), p. 100.

[3] For the attitude of the clergy see Mathieson, *English Church Reform*, pp. 42 f.

[4] *A Memoir of Charles James Blomfield, D.D., Bishop of London*, edited by Alfred Blomfield (2 vols., London, 1863), vol. i. p. 169.

Archbishop Howley was the object of daring demonstrations. Other bishops had similar experiences. It is scarcely just, when even modern writers lay the blame for these attempts in the last instance on Lord Grey. Thus Ollard (as Newman before him in his 'Apologia')[1] tells of how the Premier warned the bishops to set their 'house in order,' and finds in this a suppressed threat, by regarding it as a quotation from 2 Kings xx. 1, where Isaiah directs these words at King Hezekiah and adds 'Thou shalt die, and not live.' And he regards himself as justified in adding, that it was this which gave the signal for anti-clerical riots. But the context shows that Lord Grey did not intend such an interpretation to be put on his words, or anticipate that it would be put.[2] On the second reading, twelve Bishops voted for the Bill.

To Oxford onlookers the Prime Minister appeared an incarnation of the liberal spirit of hostility to the Church, and in the Irish Church question they found the confirmation of their suspicions, if such was wanted. The Irish Church question is also a fresh illustration of clerical blindness to the fact that Church institutions cannot any more than others be withdrawn from criticism based on ordinary human equity, which is applied in all other relations of life. The Irish Protestant State-Church certainly was an anomaly throughout its existence. In the thirties there were still as many as 8,000,000 inhabitants, of whom 6,400,000 were Roman Catholics, 850,000 Anglicans, 640,000 Presbyterians, and the rest Dissenters of various kinds. The Irish Establishment, to which thus little more than a tenth of the population belonged, had an income of over £800,000, and a hierarchy of four Archbishops and eighteen Bishops.[3] What made the State-Church particularly hateful to the Irish population was the demand of tithes. The tithe, which in the Middle Ages had never been fully collected, had since the Reformation gone to the Protestant

[1] S. L. Ollard, *A Short History of the Oxford Movement*, p. 6.

[2] Mathieson, *op. cit.* pp. 49 f.

[3] It would be easy to collect stirring details even if one put aside the purely polemical literature. In the *Greville Memoirs*, vol. iii. p. 9, we are told of a man who obtained a living in Ireland of £1000, without church, parsonage, or congregation—*i.e.* there was no Protestant in his parish. To take legal possession of his cure he had to borrow a clerk and congregation from a neighbouring parish, and with them read morning and evening prayer in the ruins of an old church.

clergy, and had come to weigh ever more heavily on the Catholic population. In 1830 discontent came to a head. The Catholic prelates gave the signal, and in 1831 tithe was unanimously refused. Parliament gave compensation to the clergy who suffered from this, and it was proposed to redeem the tithe. The next year a boycott was organised, and O'Connell began an agitation for the complete abolition of tithe. The result was the Church Temporalities Bill of 1833, which at the outset contemplated a far more radical alteration of the conditions of the Irish State-Church with quite a strong dose of disendowment, but was considerably modified during the discussion, and resulted in the suppression of eight Sees out of eighteen and two of the Archbishoprics. Yet it could justly be argued by Lord Grey, in his speech on the second reading of the Bill, that the reduction in the number of the Sees was not as great as it seemed because several had been held in union with others, both before and after the Reformation.[1] What was objectionable from the Churchman's point of view was the taking over by the State of the revenues of the suppressed Sees, although it was not the intention of the framer of the Bill, as has sometimes been supposed, that the surplus should be converted to secular uses ; it was to go in the first instance to the augmentation of poor benefices.[2] In connection with this was a proposal to reorganise the Church revenues and on account of the State to appropriate part of them.[3] This was the question which attracted most attention in the debates of the thirties on the Irish Church question.[4] The spokesmen of the Church in the House of Lords were divided. Archbishop Howley and most of his brethren protested against the proceeding as an act of arbitrary plundering of the Church on the part of the secular State, but as prominent Churchmen as Bishop Blomfield of London supported the Bill.[5] But the Irish Church question was not then definitely settled : it only was so finally by the disestablishment of the

[1] Mathieson, *English Church Reform*, p. 79. [2] Mathieson, *ibid.* p. 77.

[3] Cornish, *The English Church in the Nineteenth Century*, vol. i. p. 143.

[4] The question of taxation was solved by Lord Russell in 1838, when the liability to pay tithe was transferred from the farmers to the landowners. This avoided various occasions of scandalous disputes between Protestant clergy and their Catholic parishioners.

[5] Lock, *John Keble*, p. 78.

Irish Church in 1869. The question of the application of Church property was as critical for the Grey Ministry, the break up of which in 1834 was produced by it, as for Peel's Ministry in 1835.[1]

It is difficult to decide to what extent the alarmists were justified, when they saw in the Irish Church Bill the beginning of a general attack on the Church, and expected all kinds of drastic alterations both in ritual and Church order in the direction of greater agreement with the fashionable philosophic view. That the fear to many minds magnified the size of the danger, and that suspicions and charges against the Reform Bill statesmen were unjust, one might venture to assert. To Newman and his friends, all movements in a free direction seemed like so many different heads of the hydra of Liberalism, and they regarded Arnold as little better than Lord Grey or Bentham.[2] In the meantime statesmen began to see whom they had pierced. It is instructive to observe how the real or imagined attack on the Church was the means of evoking a thorough swing of the political pendulum. 'Alarm for the Church kindled the conservative temper in the nation. That spontaneous attachment to the old order of things with all its symbols, institutes, and deep associations, which the radical reformers had both affronted and ignored, made the Church its rallying-point.'[3] The Irish Church question contributed more than anything else to pave the way for the fall of the Whigs in 1841, and for a new Tory regime. It was the Church question which was ultimately involved in the political trials

[1] Morley, *Life of W. E. Gladstone*, vol. i. p. 113. Peel ceased to support the Grey Ministry when it seemed ready to make a serious attack on the Church.

[2] For Newman's one-sided hate of 'Liberalism' see A. M. Fairbairn, *Catholicism Roman and Anglican* (London, 1899), p. 82. A new age was beginning to dawn everywhere, and thus religion could not be the only factor to escape change: 'And when the new spirit knocked at the door of the English Church, her then most potent and active sons knew not what better thing to do than to evoke an ancient ecclesiastical ideal to answer and withstand it. And it was out of this appeal to a tried and vanquished past against a living present, that the Anglo-Catholic Movement was born. It was less the child of a great love than of a great hate, hatred of what its spokesman and founder called "Liberalism." . . . The ghost of a mediaeval Church was evoked to exorcise the resurgent spirit of Christ in men—instead of discovering the enthusiasm for justice and humanity which was to be found in the heart of Liberalism, and christianising it.'

[3] Morley, *op. cit.* p. 154.

of strength both inside and outside of Parliament in the thirties. 'The real question which divides the house is Church or no Church,' said the Duke of Wellington in 1838, and his clear soldier's eye no doubt saw correctly.

Difficult as it is for us in later days with an impartial examination to find a justification for the apocalyptic feeling in Church circles and their partisans, it will not do to mistake the sincerity of their expressions. Nor can one shut one's eyes to the possibility that perhaps far more serious blows to the existing Church did not take place because of the violent reaction that followed. As early as March 1833 Keble had published some poems against the real or expected dangers of reform in the *British Magazine*, in the pages of which the 'apostolic lyre' would be so often heard in coming years. In the first of these, 'Profanation,'[1] anger at the intrusion of impious hands in holy things has a genuine and forcible expression. When we hear of

> the ruffian band
> Come to reform, where ne'er they came to pray,

we need not feel any doubt who are meant. Other contemporary poems ('Athanasian Creed,' 'Burial Service,' 'Length of the Prayers')[2] seem to have reference to the alterations in the Liturgy that were dreaded.

Before the Irish Church Bill of 1833 had gone through Parliament, a cry of warning, which was to awake echoes throughout the country, had already been sounded from the pulpit of St. Mary-the-Virgin, the University Church of Oxford. It was Keble who on July 14 delivered his sermon on National Apostasy.[3] Taking as his text 1 Sam. xii. 23, Keble finds in Samuel's attitude a pattern for the attitude of a Christian towards a State government which is moving away from God and Christ. The 'liberalism' of the age, its growing

[1] No. 114 in *Lyra Apostolica*. Under this title were printed later the poetical contributions to the *British Magazine* of Keble, Newman, and their friends, and collected into a volume in 1836.

[2] *Lyra Apostolica*, Nos. 115–117.

[3] *National Apostasy considered in a Sermon preached in St. Mary's, Oxford, before His Majesty's Judges of Assize on Sunday, July* 14, 1832, *by John Keble, M.A., Oxford*, 1833. The occasion of the sermon, the solemn opening of the Assizes, causes it often to be described in literature as Keble's *Assize Sermon*.

indifference in religious things, is to him a sample of the same spirit which led the Jews to worship strange gods. He feels himself justified in speaking of a national apostasy. 'Disrespect to the Successors of the Apostles, as such, is an unquestionable symptom of enmity to Him Who gave them their commission at first and has pledged Himself to be with them for ever.' Saul sinned against the 'sacrificial office.' Should any State go in Saul's ways, it is probable that it will begin with sinning against the 'apostolic rights.' Like Samuel, the Christian in such a case is obliged solemnly to protest, but at the same time loyally to fulfil his duties. The Church must be instant in prayer. Every Christian must with renewed zeal devote himself to the performance of his Christian duties, and so 'adorn and recommend the doctrine.' 'I do not see how any person can devote himself too entirely to the cause of the Apostolical Church in these realms. He who does so, may have to wait long, but he may be convinced that sooner or later his side will win, and the victory will be complete, universal, eternal.' The preacher ends with the psalm *Quare fremuerunt gentes?*

We will not stay to examine the expressions we find here of the fully developed Tractarian view of the Church. We are here more closely interested by the place of Keble's sermon in the course of events. It was published soon after it was delivered, and in a preface of July 22 the author can without disguise point to its actual appropriateness. The authorities of the legislature have arbitrarily taken on themselves the commission of those to whom Our Saviour entrusted at least a voice in Church legislation. 'The Apostolic Church is now in the eyes of the State only one sect among many. How can we meet attacks from the partisans of the Bishop of Rome, when they accuse us of being only a Parliamentary Church?'

The gentle poet of the *Christian Year* had found strong and striking expression for widespread fears and feelings. We have seen how the movement for reform, which was partly inspired by thoughts which had no place for the irrational, or rather super-rational, values of real religion, through the one-sided conservatism of Churchmen took a more decided anti-Church direction than it need have done. But it was led thereby to steps which prepared its own fall. The same

agencies which opened Keble's mouth had already begun to evoke a reaction in the feeling of the country, which grew side by side with the thoughts of the Oxford men. Only this can explain how the preaching of a national apostasy, natural as it might be in the stronghold of clerical conservatism, awoke a more general echo. It was not that the devoted preacher of apostolic ideas by the word of his mouth saved the Church from ruin, but no doubt he freed from the trance of unconsciousness what was stirring in the breasts of many.

On July 9, five days before Keble's sermon at St. Mary's, Newman had landed in England and reached his mother's home at Iffley, near Oxford, from a half-year's journey in Mediterranean countries.[1] He himself has testified how the forces of life swelled within him on his return home. At the height of his vitality and energy one of the strongest geniuses of the century threw himself into the struggle which was then beginning. On September 9 of the same year the first of the 'Tracts for the Times' came out, and thus the curtain went up for one of the most exciting and fate-fraught scenes in the Church history of the nineteenth century. It loses nothing but rather gains in vividness and force through the limitations of the stage and the small number of the actors.

[1] *Letters and Correspondence*, vol. i. p. 411 (ed. 1903, p. 361).

## CHAPTER VIII

### SCENA—DRAMATIS PERSONAE

'THE stage on which what is called the Oxford Movement ran through its course had a special character of its own, unlike the circumstances in which other religious efforts had done their work. The scene of Jansenism had been a great capital, a brilliant society, the precincts of a court, the cells of a convent, the studies and libraries of the doctors of the Sorbonne, the council chambers of the Vatican. The scene of Methodism had been English villages and country towns, the moors of Cornwall, and the collieries of Bristol, at length London fashionable chapels. The scene of this new movement was as like as it could be in our modern world to a Greek πόλις, or an Italian self-centred city of the Middle Ages. Oxford stood by itself in its meadows by the rivers, having its relations with all England, but, like its sister at Cambridge, living a life of its own, unlike that of any other spot in England, with its privileged powers, and exemptions from the general law, with its special mode of government and police, its usages and tastes and traditions, and even costume, which the rest of England looked at from the outside, much interested but much puzzled, or knew only by transient visits. And Oxford was as proud and jealous of its own ways as Athens or Florence; and, like them, it had its quaint fashions of polity; its democratic Convocation and its oligarchy; its social ranks; its discipline, severe in theory and usually lax in fact; its self-governed bodies and corporations within itself; its faculties and colleges, like the guilds and "arts" of Florence; its internal rivalries and discords; its "sets" and factions. Like these, too, it professed a special recognition of the supremacy of religion; it claimed to be a home of worship and religious

training, *Dominus illuminatio mea*, a claim too often falsified in the habit and tempers of life.'[1]

It would be presumptuous to attempt to rival this description, which the classic historian of the Oxford Movement, and one of its most brilliant disciples, gives of the academic and clerical republic on the Isis. He adds that Oxford was a place where everyone knew his neighbour, and where personal inclinations, antipathies, and friendly connections were perhaps the most important factors in the formation of parties. At the same time he might have emphasised more strongly than he has done the remoteness from the freer tendencies of contemporary thought, which was a consequence of the clerical character of the University; subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles was required of every candidate for any of its positions, and it was incumbent on every new member of the teaching corporation to take Holy Orders.

A Roman Catholic historian has described how Church history once took its way along the main street of Wittenberg, the road from the Augustinian Convent to the Castle Church. So it may with reason be said that English Church history once walked through Oriel Street, the narrow lane which leads down from High Street and the church of St. Mary-the-Virgin to Oriel College, and that the memories of the walk have not faded away. Where Oriel Street, Bear Lane, and Merton Street behind the complex of Christ Church meet in an irregular square is the old gateway of Oriel College. This leads the visitor into the first quadrangle, surrounded by buildings which in spite of the weathered surface of the stone facing do not go back to the year 1326, when Edward II through his almoner Adam de Brome founded Oriel. The present buildings were erected in the seventeenth century; the side facing the entrance, which contains the Chapel and the Hall, is a prominent example of the mixture peculiar to Oxford of a Gothic, which had survived, and the architecture of Caroline times—a combination which hardly needed the external marking by statues of Edward II and Charles I side by side over the built-out staircase leading to the Hall.

The right wing which bounds the quadrangle on the south is occupied by rooms for students and Fellows. The entrance

[1] R. W. Church, *The Oxford Movement* (London, 1891), pp. 139 f.

nearest the Chapel leads the visitor, if he goes up the worn oak staircase to the second story, to a set of rooms now as in the thirties occupied by a Fellow of Oriel. They were then occupied by J. H. Newman. Though in our previous narrative we have frequently met his name and sketched a few phases in his development, it is necessary, before we go further, to try to fix his portrait in sharper outline. There is plenty of material to describe exactly the immediate surroundings in which his friends usually found him—at his high desk surrounded by folios,[1] often disturbed by visitors, as often as not messengers from the printer—or to call up to ourselves his actual features and form. An often reproduced lithograph from Richmond's drawing [2] gives rather an idealised conception, as does J. A. Froude's comparison between the faces of Newman and Julius Caesar. It may be corrected by a few sketches which more or less involuntarily caricature the subject, and by an engraving from a contemporary painting, which shows a spectacled Don with projecting lower lip, a picture very unlike Richmond's young god.

A contemporary thus describes his impression of Newman's appearance: 'A singularly graceful form in cap and gown glided into the room. The slender figure and winning way of talking might have belonged either to a youthful ascetic of the Middle Ages or a gracious noble lady of our own time. He was pale and thin, almost emaciated, quick in his movements, but when he was not walking, very quiet, with a soft and pathetic voice, so plain that one could count the vowels and consonants in every individual word. When he touched on a subject which interested him, he used quick and definite but not violent gestures.' [3] Another admirer saw little that was imposing in his appearance in the street—except that one saw that he was entirely absorbed by an object outside himself; but he also bore witness of 'the impression he received of the loftiness of Newman's appearance when one really came to know and study it,' his humility, a virgin purity of heart, and he talks of 'a wonderfully caressing manner, which had

[1] *Letters and Correspondence*, vol. ii. p. 204 (ed. 1903, p. 182).

[2] Ward's *Life of Newman*, frontispiece to vol. i. The original has now been acquired by Oriel College and hangs in the smaller Common-Room. It is widely different from the lithograph.

[3] Aubrey de Vere in Ward's *Life*, vol. i. p. 66.

nothing of weakness in it, but one recognised that it was an imparting of strength from a strong soul.'[1] One could multiply these descriptions. They would all together testify to the magic power that proceeded from his personality, irresistible to all who really came in contact with him, but at the same time to something awe-inspiring, which had an oppressive effect and kept many at a distance. This hangs together with one of the most strongly developed features in his character: a self-centredness,[2] an inability to give himself away in love to a fellow man, which is in strong contrast to the excess of love and admiration which was lavished on him. 'I think I am very cold and reserved to people, but I cannot ever realise to myself that anyone loves me.'[3] But at another time he can speak with gratitude of

> 'Blessings of friends, which to my door
> Unask'd, unhoped have come.'[4]

It was no accident that in his time he was to endow literature with one of its immortal autobiographies. We recognise again the self-mirroring and the merciless analysis, which at the same time seems to give a certain refined enjoyment, heightened to a degree which has an almost morbid effect, in the remarkable document, in which Newman long afterwards describes in the minutest details the fever of which he nearly died in his Sicilian tour in May 1833. He recounts how he could not induce himself to give his Italian servant a blue coat to which the man took a fancy. He had had it ten years, and even in 1840, when he writes, he has it still at Littlemore: 'I have so few things to sympathise with me, that I take to cloaks.'[5] We shall come across the self-centred motive again in Newman's religion.

If the casual visitor, who did not have time to come properly under the influence of the fascinating personality of his host, felt a kind of uncertainty and oppression in his presence, what

[1] W. Lockhart, 'Cardinal Newman,' *Reminiscences of Fifty Years Since* (London, 1891), p. 4. Lockhart went over to Rome before Newman.

[2] 'Autocentrisme. Ce mot devrait revenir à chaque page d'une étude sur Newman': H. Bremond, *Newman* (Paris, 1906), p. 43.

[3] *Letters*, vol. ii. p. 242 (ed. 1903, vol. ii. p. 182).

[4] *Verses on Various Occasions* (London, 1883), No. 14, p. 42.

[5] *Letters*, vol. i. p. 429 (ed. 1903, vol. i. p. 377).

must he have experienced who could see deeper and discern some of the secrets of his nature still hidden from himself or presaged his coming destiny? This young University man in his black long-coat,[1] and the white cravat, then traditional for the Anglican clergy, was in his time to exchange them for the monk's habit and finally for the Cardinal's purple. At the beginning of the Tractarian campaign he would have been the first to laugh at such a prophecy. Yet already he had in the destinies of his life more clearly than most people experienced the leading of an invisible hand towards a hidden goal. It was on the way home from the Mediterranean journey, between Palermo and Marseilles, that he wrote:

> 'Lead, kindly Light, amid the encircling gloom,
> Lead Thou me on!
> The night is dark, and I am far from home—
> Lead Thou me on.
> Keep Thou my feet; I do not ask to see
> The distant scene,—one step enough for me.'[2]

In the end, even the historian must come to read his life in the light of these immortal lines. But even then were formed in him the germs of the coming development, which though they externally took shape in outward actions, in the exchange of one school for another, and one Church form for another, yet in reality consisted in the growth of his religious genius. The activity of his religious endowment led him constantly on, and permitted no standing still,[3] but thus it came about that he as few of his century enriched the common religious experience of Christendom. It is a presumption if any single communion claims him entirely for its own. In spite of the zeal with which he himself was wont to emphasise the dogmatic differences between groups of Christians, few reach so fully as he that elevated ground where these expressions

[1] This soon became a distinguished mark of the young guard of the Tractarian school, a symbol of their 'credo in Newmannum.'

[2] *Lyra Apostolica*, No. 25.

[3] When Newman, in *Apologia*, says: 'From the time I became a Catholic, of course I have no further history of my religious opinions to narrate. . . . I have had no changes to record' (*Apologia*, p. 373; ed. 1908, p. 238), it is difficult not to see in this a species of self-deception. It would undoubtedly be refuted by a critical study of the documents of his Catholic period.

of the shifting reflection of revelation through different individual and national mediums fade away and disappear.

It is Newman who raises the Oxford Movement to a higher plane than would otherwise have belonged to it, if it had come into existence at all without his leadership, and he ennobles even trivial controversies, if in no other way, at least by his mastery of the pen. But there was always something in him which strove to get out of the narrow ring-fence of Tractarianism, and could not be confined within it for any length of time. So his participation in the Oxford Movement exposes its chronicler constantly to the risk of losing himself in the wide perspective opened out by Newman's personal development—a perspective which leads far outside the bounds of Anglican Church history, and yet neither the movement, nor Newman's part in it, becomes conceivable without any regard to it. But every attempt at a brief estimate must be unsatisfactory, not least because there can scarcely be found any sufficiently profound and impartial representation to point to. The chief reason of this is the depth of the non-rational side of his nature, due to his rare religious endowment, especially as this was joined with, and contended with, an intellect the acuteness of which equally surpassed ordinary standards. No wonder that his contemporaries found something of a riddle in his nature. It is little less so for posterity, in spite of the fuller material that is at their disposal. The only biography on a large scale that we possess is written by a Roman Catholic and treats Newman's Anglican period too summarily. It must therefore be completed by other descriptions of him.[1]

[1] W. Ward, *The Life of John Henry Newman, based on his Private Journals and Correspondence* (2 vols., London, 1912), devotes not quite a hundred pages of two thick volumes to the first half of Newman's life. In some respects it is completed by the interesting studies of Newman in the author's *Last Lectures*, edited by Mrs. W. Ward (London, 1918). For this period we have instead to go to his correspondence, with a fragment of an autobiography, meritoriously compiled in *Letters and Correspondence of John Henry Newman during his Life in the English Church. With a brief Autobiography*, edited at Cardinal Newman's request by Anne Mozley (2 vols., London, 1891). This collection is unfortunately incomplete, but can be supplemented partly by letters given in Liddon's *Life of Pusey*, partly by *Correspondence of John Henry Newman with John Keble and others, 1839–1845, edited at the Birmingham Oratory* (London, 1917). Here are various letters of the greatest value for throwing light on the crisis in Newman's life, during which they were written.

The Tractarian period is the third phase in Newman's religious history, and the character of his inner life at this period had been shaped by three special crises. They have been alluded to in our introductory study. The first crisis was that which Newman never ceased to regard as his conversion: he was more sure of its reality than that he had hands and feet. It was through the influence of his Calvinistic schoolmaster, and the books he supplied him with, that this crisis came in the autumn of 1816.[1] It has been already pointed out how the Calvinistic impress never quite passed away from Newman's theology and devotion.[2] He has himself described how the conviction that he belonged to the number of the elect, which was the result of his conversion, helped to 'isolate me from the objects which surrounded me, to confirm me in my mistrust of the reality of material phenomena, and to make me rest in the thought of two and two only supreme and luminously

The correspondence, together with Newman's complete works of his Anglican period, serve as a supplement and corrective to his famous Autobiography, the *Apologia pro vita sua* (London, 1864), written as a defence against a violent attack by Kingsley. E. A. Abbott, *Anglican Career of Cardinal Newman* (2 vols., London, 1892), gives a valuable critical treatment of the biographic material, but suffers from lack of sympathy with the object of investigation, and has too partisan a stamp owing to the self-satisfied peevishness of the author. Among shorter monographs the most meritorious is R. H. Hutton's *Cardinal Newman*, in the series 'Leaders of Religion' (1st ed., London, 1891). By the side of it may be quoted the Roman Catholic, W. Barry, *Newman* (3rd ed., London, 1905); a sketch by S. P. Cadman, *The Three Religious Leaders of Oxford and their Movements* (New York, 1916); C. Sarolea, *Cardinal Newman and his Influence on Religious Life and Thought* ('World's Epoch-makers'; Edinburgh, 1908); Lady Charlotte Blennerhasset, *Kardinal Newman, Beitrag zur religiösen Entwicklungsgeschichte der Gegenwart* (Berlin, 1904), also in English translation. The chief attempt at psychological analysis is H. Bremond, *Newman. Essai de biographie psychologique* (Paris, 1906)—Eng. tr.; *The Mystery of Newman*, tr. M. C. Corrance, with Introduction by Rev. George Tyrrell (London, 1907)—supplemented by Inge's brilliant sketch in *Outspoken Essays* (London, 1919). The chief Swedish treatment is N. Söderblom's sketch in *Religionsproblemet* (Stockholm, 1910), vol. i. pp. 33–76. Finally we may quote some dissertations—A. MacRae, *Die religiöse Gewissheit bei J. H. Newman* (Diss., Jena, 1898); A. P. Jorimann, *Exposé critique de la doctrine de Newman* (Thèse Genève, 1904); R. Gout, *Du Protestantisme au Catholicisme* (Thèse Montauban, Auduse, 1904); and the thorough work of H. Stoel, *Kardinaal Newman* (1801–90); Eerste Deel, *Zijn Strijd om de ware Kerke* (1801–45) (Groningen, 1914).

[1] *Apologia*, p. 58 (ed. 1908, p. 4); *Letters*, vol. i. p. 22 (ed. 1903, vol. i. p. 18).

[2] Cp. R. Gout, *Du protestantisme au catholicisme*, pp. 46 f.

self-evident beings, myself and my Creator.'[1] This all-shadowing faith in God's sovereign reality and presence with man, and the personal Ego as its equally unavoidable correlative, is the central point of Newman's religion. It appears in different forms in his Anglican preaching, and its relation to the self-centred side of his character is evident. Newman's theology was always to him an intensely personal affair: it concerned his own salvation. And the feature of awfulness, the feeling of the terrible seriousness of the religious life, which runs through his sermons, comes in the last resort from the early Calvinistic training. To the same is also probably due the passionate thirst for holiness, which forms one of the strongest driving impulses in his development. It is characteristic that the adjective *moral* is often with Newman synonymous with *religious*, and it is no accident when conscience is his name for the religious organ, which would later be the centre of his theory of religious knowledge. It is the name for the very basis of personality: others have found different appellations for the same concept, but the choice of words shows how in Newman the idea has a strongly ethical orientation. Another very important feature in Newman's religious individuality goes back to this earliest stage of development. 'I fell under the influence of a definite creed, and received into my intellect impressions of dogma which, through God's mercy, have never been effaced or obscured.' In these early impressions lies, perhaps, the explanation of what must stand as an axiom necessary for an understanding of Newman's whole development: the requirement of an external authority, which answers to the religious sense of the individual, and which, when this has given the simple assent of faith, can dictate to it its whole dogmatic system, and this corresponds both with the soul's religious needs and with the requirement of the moral law, both being

[1] *Apologia*, p. 59 (ed. 1908, p. 4); cp. *Sermons on Subjects of the Day*, p. 38: 'Earth must fade away from our eyes, and we must anticipate the great and solemn truth, which we shall not fully understand, until we stand before God in judgment, that to us there are but two beings in the whole world, God and ourselves. The sympathy of others, the pleasant voice, the glad eye, the smiling countenance, the thrilling heart, which at present are our very life, all will be away from us, when Christ comes in judgment.'

united together in one in Newman's 'conscience.'[1] Time was needed before he was to develop his thoughts systematically. Though they seem to be built on foundations laid already during the evangelical period, it is only after the liberal phase that we meet the conception of the relation of faith and reason, which was to be typical of Newman, worked out with the clearness which was only possible for one who had really tried to let the intellect seriously take the lead.

It must be enough here to recall what was previously said of Newman's relation to the Noetic school, and especially to Whately, and how without doubt he got from this source most of the dialectic training which was to make him the formidable controversialist he always remained. It is hard on the basis of 'Apologia' and the letters preserved to get a clear idea how far Newman's Liberalism went. Probably his own words are best as giving a general impression: 'The truth is I was beginning to prefer intellectual excellence to moral; I was drifting in the direction of Liberalism.'[2] Much points to the fact that it was a time of great intellectual, and chiefly receptive, activity.[3] He begins to learn Hebrew, and practises his pen on various subjects. It seems also to have been the time when his aesthetic sense got more free-play than at other times, his feeling for nature as well as his musical talents. He condescends to become the wine-taster of his college. Probably it

[1] 'The mischief of Newman's view of spiritual things was that it distorted all these truths by taking them out of the province of morality into that of authority' (Abbott, *op. cit.* vol. ii. p. 27; cp. Bremond, *op. cit.* p. 414). Here may be quoted a memorable remark of Hort, occasioned by Newman's *Apologia*: 'Two things specially struck me: the unquestioning assumption that there is one absolutely and exclusively Divine system in all things, especially one Church so entirely right that all other bodies must be entirely wrong, and the complete permanence of his Calvinistic religion, changing nothing but its form when it passed most naturally into Romanism, and placing him throughout in a position where the vision of pure truth as distinguished from edification, *i.e.* religious expediency, was a simple impossibility' (A. Hort, *Life and Letters of F. J. A. Hort* (London, 1896), vol. ii. pp. 35 f.).

[2] *Apologia*, p. 72 (ed. 1908, p. 17).

[3] Bremond is certainly right that the thirst for knowledge in general is little developed in Newman, at least during his later life: 'Il ne me semble pas possédé du désir de connaître. La curiosité au noble sens de ce mot est loin d'égaler chez lui les puissances de connaître' (*op. cit.* p. 104).

was now that he got his abiding impress of refinement and almost fastidious personal culture.[1]

He regarded the end of 1827 as the termination of this period of his life. External occurrences brought about an internal crisis: a serious illness in 1827, and the death of a sister in January 1828. The public decision came in 1829, when he took an active part in the agitation against Peel at the bye-election.

We cannot stay here to examine more closely the personal factors that brought about the change. Newman himself pointed to 'The Christian Year,' and the influence of Keble's thought. What he actually says he received from Keble was 'the sacramental system,' and an interpretation of Butler's principle of probability as 'an argument from Personality'; it is only when faith has laid hold of its object that grounds of probability are valid.[2] Friendship with Hurrell Froude, of whom we shall have more to say presently, had a more intense personal effect. But it is necessary to determine in what properly consists the thorough-going new orientation of Newman's mind. Probably the deepest factor is a newly won conviction of the primacy of faith and the royal right of the religious organ 'conscience.' Perhaps the revolution began, or became clearly conscious, only after he had taken up a position in Church politics. The intellectual process is not completed, perhaps just perceived, when in 'A Thanksgiving' (October 20, 1829) among objects for thanksgiving he includes

> Blessings, when reason's awful power
> Gave thought a bolder range.[3]

[1] One must beware of exaggerating the importance of Newman's carefully formulated self-accusation. The longing for holiness continued to exist. Though it does not always stand in the foreground, it may even now find expression in striking language. Thus, *e.g.*, in the first Sermon in vol. i. of *Parochial Sermons*, 'Holiness Necessary for Future Blessedness' (1826). I quote from it only its characteristically negative definition of the nature of holiness: 'To be holy is to be separate from sin, to hate the works of the world, the flesh and the devil, to take pleasure in keeping God's commandments, to do things as He would have us do them, to live habitually as in the sight of the world to come, as if we had broken the ties of this life, and were dead already.'

[2] *Apologia*, pp. 78 f. (1903, pp. 19 f.).

[3] *Verses on Various Occasions* (1883), p. 41, No. 14; also in *Lyra Apostolica*, No. 23.

But in a University sermon, delivered December 11, 1831, with the title 'The Usurpations of Reason,'[1] he sees in the history of revelation chiefly man's moral power triumphing over the intellectual, 'the triumph of holiness over ability'; 'unlearned faith, maintaining its ground by its own indwelling strength, dominated the understanding as long as its own interests came in question, and has applied it in the Church from that time, first as a captive, afterwards as a servant, not as an equal, and in no way (far from it) as a protector.'[2] Thus the conviction of the primacy of faith over reason took up the dominant position for Newman which it always retained, and which was to have its best known expression in the 'Grammar of Assent.' It is the primacy of Faith over Reason, and also it seems over the purely intellectual interests, at times also over the aesthetic sense. When on his Mediterranean journey he reaches the Ionian Islands, his thought passes away from the classical memories which contact with these western outposts of Greece call forth, to the Church of the Greek Fathers:

> Let others sing thy heathen praise,
> Fall'n Greece! The thought of holier days
> In my sad heart abides—[3]

On a visit to the home of his friend Froude he gives one day in a letter a rapturous description of the beauty of nature, but in a poem some days later he seems to regard it as incumbent upon him to renounce its enjoyment:

> There stray'd awhile, amid the woods of Dart,
> One who could love them, but who durst not love.
> A vow had bound him, ne'er to give his heart
> To streamlet bright, or soft secluded grove.[4]

[1] *Sermons chiefly on the Theory of Religious Belief, preached before the University of Oxford* (London, 1843). The later editions have the title: *Fifteen Sermons preached before the University of Oxford.* These sermons may fitly be seen in the background of the first of the collection, *The Philosophical Temper first enjoined in the Gospel*, of 1826, with its positive and cheerful conception of the necessity of enquiry: the content of revelation cannot really be in conflict with the truths 'which He has written on the face of Nature.' See also in *Parochial and Plain Sermons*, the sermons 'Faith and Obedience,' vol. iii. p. 8, and 'Obedience to God the Way to Faith in Christ,' vol. viii. p. 14; also the essay on Newman's philosophy in W. Ward, *Last Lectures.*

[2] P. 42 (ed. 1909, p. 58).

[3] Poem, 'The Greek Fathers,' dated 'off Zante,' December 28, 1832, No. 91 in *Lyra Apostolica*; *Verses on Various Occasions*, No. 51.

[4] *Letters*, vol. i. p. 242 (1903, vol. i. p. 213); *Verses on Various Occasions*, No. 20.

Not without reason must one ask oneself whether an intellect as powerful and acute as that of Newman could in the long run be content with a subordinate position in relation to faith. At least it will be wise, it seems to me, to reckon with the possibility that at times it unconsciously took the reins, and perhaps in this is an explanation of much that may appear mysterious in his nature and development. In his continuous development faith and thought are so intimately combined that it is seldom possible to say which has the lead. But though thought at times perhaps got the start of faith, it was yet a thought once for all subdued, which at any time could be recalled to obedience. On the other side it seems as if the subordinate position which the intellect took up with Newman, made it possible for him to make a more regardless use of the dialectical acuteness of which he had such a large measure. Since thought and criticism can never be foundations of the life of faith, and their result has no meaning for the judgment of the religious mind, they become far more handy tools, in so far as their use involves less responsibility. This perhaps gives the explanation of the accusation of scepticism which was so often directed against Newman. To him the play of thought with destructive suppositions was a spending of time without danger, which could never disturb the sovereign repose of faith. But it was not so for others, and one cannot help seeing how near such an idea in effect comes to the old doctrine of a double truth.

With the recognition of the absolute primacy of faith appears the demand for authority with new strength, authority in the form of a dogmatic system. He seeks and finds this naturally enough in his own Church. But the more strongly he became conscious that its present condition was one of weakness and humiliation, the more zealous he became to make its past speak and bear its witness of its real nature. It is thus with a preconceived idea of what could be got from the classic theology of High Anglicanism that he turns his attention to the Anglican Divines of the seventeenth century. In spite of all divergence he is convinced of the possibility of detecting in them a dogmatic *consensus*, grand and scriptural at the same time. He

first speaks of this in the autumn of 1826,[1] but then this old Anglican theology is to him *terra incognita*. It was only later that he took up its study in earnest, and then with a more conscious interest in Church politics. Somewhat earlier he had begun to make acquaintance with the primitive Fathers,[2] but it was only in 1828 he set about a systematic study of them. In 1830 he accepted a proposal from Rose that he should write on the early Christian Councils for a projected comprehensive work: it resulted in the most important of his earlier works, 'The Arians of the Fourth Century,' which came out in 1833 with a dedication to Keble. It is a work of undoubted learning, and in its day not without scientific value. It traced Arianism back to its real source in Antioch. But its chief importance was in the effect the studies which produced it had on the author. Of this we have his own undoubtedly trustworthy witness in *Apologia*.[3] It was during this work that he seriously began to seek and find in the early Church 'the true exponent of the doctrines of Christendom and the basic principles of the English Church.' The idea he regards himself as having got from Bishop Bull. Now Alexandrine theology, especially that of Clement and Origen, took him captive. He found one of his tasks in defending their purity of doctrine. 'Certain parts of this doctrine . . . came as music to my inward ear.' Thus the 'mystical and sacramental principle,' according to which Nature is a parable and Scripture an allegory. In close connection with this was the doctrine of a *disciplina arcani*, and an *economy*, that is to say an adaptation in the imparting of the truth of faith with respect to the environment—both which thoughts were to come to play a fatal part during the Oxford Movement, more by the suspicions they roused than by their actual application. In the doctrine of angels and demons of Alexandrian Fathers, particularly Origen, new food

[1] In a letter to S. Rickards (November 26, 1826), *Letters*, vol. i. p. 142 (1903, p. 125), when he urges him to make an extract of the views of the Anglican Fathers, which, however, he refused: he knew them sufficiently to see the impossibility of harmonising their opinions into a system for practical application.

[2] *Letters*, vol. i. p. 127 (1903, p. iii). The reading of Milner's *Church History* had given him his first impression of the Fathers.

[3] P. 88 (1908, p. 25).

was given to the fantastic presuppositions of this kind, which had lived on in Newman since childhood, and constantly kept undisturbed possession of their own section of this wonderfully composite personality. But while the work progressed the subject acquired a new actuality. Was there not here a remedy for the afflicted and pusillanimous Church of his own day? Was not the historical 'latitudinarian' theology, with its concessions to the liberalism of the day and its courtier-like moderation, a parallel to the Arianising court theology of the fourth century? Where were now the Church's self-vanquishing ascetics, patient martyrs, and resolute bishops? Where was there an Athanasius?

> When shall our northern Church her champion see
> Raised by Divine decree,
> To shield the Ancient Truth at his own harm? [1]

In proportion as his bitterness rose against these 'Liberals,' under which name he included a quite motley band, all these 'men of presumptuous heart' who would 'halve the Gospel of God's grace,' [2] in the same proportion the early Church grew before his eyes. It is specially plain during the Mediterranean journey, when generally the impressions of recent years ripened and took shape. The coming years were to show how deeply the picture of the early Church, as he saw it, was burnt into Newman's soul. It became the rock on which his Anglicanism was at last to suffer shipwreck. It need scarcely be said that Newman was drawn to the early Church in the first place by other motives than those which directed the eyes of the Romantic school to the Middle Ages. To him it was first and foremost the thirst for holiness, which was satisfied in associating with martyrs and confessors. Those were times when it cost something to be a Christian—perhaps he was beginning half unconsciously to contrast with them the comfortable calm of the Anglican Church and the married ease of its clergy.[3] These heroes of the Early Church lived—

[1] *Lyra Apostolica*, No. 94. [2] *Ibid.* No. 109 ('Liberalism').

[3] In the novel, *Loss and Gain*, where in 1848 he depicted the process by which a young student is gradually drawn to Rome, and wove in a number of autobiographic traits, we find similar thoughts in the hero, Charles Reding, long before he seriously thinks of going over (*e.g.*, pp. 228 f.).

of this he became ever more vividly conscious—and were witnesses of all that happened and was said within his Church. Thus the doctrine of *communio sanctorum* to his faith became a living and awful reality.[1] His idea of the early Church he drew out in a series of sketches in the *British Magazine* from 1838 onwards, and in 1846 these were collected in the volume 'The Church of the Fathers.' This probably gives the best presentation of his view of the Early Church during his Anglican period, just as the novel 'Callista' does the same for his later life in the Roman Church.

Was Newman a historian in the proper sense of the word? The question has been answered in both the affirmative and the negative, and its answer would require a more thorough special investigation than can be undertaken in this work. In some respects he certainly had rare qualifications for a historian's task in the acuteness of his genius, and also in a power of imagination which made it easy for him to enter into the life of past days, and gave life and colour to his descriptions. But these qualities were neutralised in too high a degree by others less advantageous for a historian. He lacked critical training. The contemporary English University system was dominated by a scholastic tradition, which did not lose its unhistorical character by the elements it received from the thought of the eighteenth century. From every contact with the seething critical industry of the Continent, which gave impetus to the historical works of Arnold and Milman, Newman was well guarded by his ignorance of the German language. It is too early here to raise the question where he got his idea of development: it belongs to a later phase, and is one of the factors which led him away from that form of Anglicanism which he himself contributed to coin. His conception of history still bears the impress of a scholasticism which shows itself chiefly in inability to see in the past the process of uninterrupted growth—an inability which he shared with the great majority of his contemporaries. Epochs of history are to him homogeneous units, with something of the timeless character of philosophical categories: this applies to seventeenth-century Anglicanism, and in a still higher

[1] See especially a sermon of 1835 on 'The Intermediate State' (*Parochial and Plain Sermons*, vol. iii. p. 385).

degree to his idea of the early Church. It was the Church of the fourth and fifth centuries with which he was specially familiar, and from it he gets his general picture of the early Church. The gulf that divided the old Catholic Church from the Apostolic was to him hidden. Moreover, Church history never had to him a theoretic interest in the first place. In every period of the past he sought doctrines for the present and weapons for the controversies of the day — and one might add: each of the Fathers of the Church became unconsciously to him a mirror which reproduced his own portrait.

Among the factors which determined Newman's development and thus contributed to the Oxford Movement, we have hitherto set aside the personal as far as possible. They must now be examined for themselves, not least because they all made direct contribution to the Neo-Anglican movement, alongside of their indirect bearing on Newman's history.

We return to Oriel. The room over Newman's was occupied then, as now, by a Fellow of Oriel. Richard Hurrell Froude[1] was born in 1803, in a country parsonage of the old Anglican type, described in the brightest colours by Hurrell's far more famous brother, James Anthony Froude. His father, Archdeacon Froude, was a High Churchman of the old school: 'The Church itself he regarded as part of the constitution, and the Prayer Book as an Act of Parliament, which only folly or disloyalty could quarrel with.'[2] After leaving Eton Hurrell entered Oriel in 1821. In the same year he lost his mother, and sorrow seems to have roused the deeper feelings which hitherto had lain hid under an amiable and debonair exterior. A certain gracious playfulness continued to be a distinguishing feature of him throughout his short life, and in combination with personal beauty contributed to give him an uncommon fascination and win for him a warm devotion from those who were brought into contact with

[1] The chief source for Froude's short life is his *Remains*, edited by friends (1838–39, in 4 vols.), a publication which had a fatal significance for the development of the movement. The only attempt at a monograph I know is Louise Imogen Guiney, *Hurrell Froude, Memoranda and Comments* (London, 1904).

[2] J. A. Froude, *Short Studies on Great Subjects* (1907), vol. v. p. 183.

him.[1] As one of the distinguishing marks of the society out of which the Oxford Movement proceeded, has been pointed out the enthusiastic friendship which the celibate common life of a College was apt to produce, and no one was the object of such feelings in a higher degree than Hurrell Froude. He came closely under Keble's influence, especially after he had been his pupil at Southrop in 1823. The result of his Final School in 1824 was disappointing to expectation, for he did not obtain more than a second class either in *Literae Humaniores* or in Mathematics,[2] but in 1826 he had the honour of being elected Fellow of Oriel.

Through Keble's influence he seems to have gone through a process of purely religious awakening, but at the same time his High Church view was worked upon in a new direction. Probably Keble put into his hands the Anglican classics (Hooker, Taylor, Wilson, and Law) [3] and also the early Fathers.[4] He did not study either very deeply. Froude's Diary for 1826 and 1827, which has been preserved, gives an insight—so intimate, that the reader feels at times he is committing an indiscretion—into a serious, though sometimes trivially scrupulous, effort at self-training, and at a struggle against what he regarded as the enemies of his better self: effeminacy, laziness, self-indulgence, and vanity. Thus we read under date October 8, 1826: 'Was ashamed to have it known that I had no gloves. Talked about matters of morality in a way that might leave the impression that I thought myself free from some vices, which I censured: this was unintentional, but silly. Could not attend as I ought at the Sacrament Service . . . felt so disinclined to come to evening Church that I wished it would rain for an excuse, but

[1] 'To a form of singular elegance, and a countenance of that peculiar and highest kind of beauty which flows from purity of heart and mind, he added manners the most refined and engaging. That air of sunny cheerfulness, which is best expressed by the French word *riant*, never forsook him at the time I knew him best, and diffused itself, as is its wont, over every circle in which he moved' (Oakeley, *Historical Notes on the Tractarian Movement* (London, 1865), p. 5).

[2] In a letter, February 1, 1826, to Keble, he describes in playful Latin his failure: 'Crede mihi, idem sum ille φρονδος, qui utroque pede claudicans e scholis evasi: me in nulla re scholastica, ex illo tempore usque ad hunc diem, sentio profecisse' (*Remains*, vol. i. p. 194).

[3] *Ibid.* vol. i. p. 206.

[4] *Ibid.* vol. i. p. 209.

was thoroughly ashamed of myself, and went in spite of a storm. The sun set on the sea, wild and imposing beyond description. Could not keep myself awake during the Sermon.'[1] He imposes on himself fasts and self-denials,[2] and puts down with painful exactness his negligences in carrying out the prescribed purposes. Possibly by this amateurish asceticism, he sowed the seeds of his disease. This sometimes trivial self-scrutiny stands out in another light, when one learns that his joyous nature never betrayed to those around him anything of the suffering of his inner life: 'bright and beautiful' was the impression he left behind him.[3] He was a bold rider, and loved to sail in rough water. Even in the days of sickness a fresh breeze of courage and knightly combativeness goes through his correspondence.

None of the Oriel circle was in so high a degree a child of Romanticism as Froude. It appears in his poetic vein, not rich, but clear and genuine, in his feeling for Nature, and not less in his historical and political sympathies. This comes out specially in two poems of 1826 which, as the author himself points out, were influenced by Rousseau. But along with the romance of Nature, the romance of the past finds expression here:

> Is it for nought that things gone by
> Still hover o'er our wandering mind
> And dreary feelings dimly high
> A dwelling-place within us find? [4]

His inherited Tory sympathies were sharpened by the oncoming tide of Liberalism, and 'King Charles the Martyr' had few more faithful adorers. But in later times the Non-Jurors alone won his approbation. First and foremost his sympathies went back to the Middle Ages, the idealised Middle Age of romance, which spoke to him through Gothic architecture,[5] and the Latin Liturgy, to which he was introduced by Lloyd's

[1] *Remains*, vol. i. p. 20.

[2] November 12, 1826: 'Felt great reluctance to sleep on the floor last night, and was nearly arguing myself out of it' (*Ibid.* vol. i. p. 44).

[3] Church, *The Oxford Movement*, p. 35.

[4] *Remains*, vol. i. p. 208.

[5] Froude may in a measure claim the doubtful honour of having prepared the way for the Gothic revival of the nineteenth century. See the essays on 'Church Architecture' in *Remains*, vol. ii. pp. 335–374.

lectures, and the society of Blanco White. His youthful enthusiasm for the beauty and also the religious inwardness and seriousness he found in this quarter, were unfortunately not outweighed by any deep knowledge So he was led on to give a pernicious example of contemptuous expressions about the Reformation. Among the *obiter dicta*, which his friends thought it worth while to preserve, are such as these: 'The Reformation was a limb badly set, it must be broken again in order to be righted';[1] and on another occasion he can express his surprise that 'a thoughtful fellow like H. does not get to hate the Reformers faster.' Probably these utterances are from the period after 1833, when analogies are also found in his letters. Thus in a letter to Newman of December 26, 1835: 'Really I hate the Reformation, and the Reformers more and more, and have almost made up my mind that the rationalist spirit they set afloat is the ψευδοπροφήτης of the Revelation.'[2] Though it is the definite Protestantism of the Puritans—Milton is specially in disfavour[3]—and Dissenters which is chiefly the object of his dislike, neither Luther nor Cranmer escapes.[4] On the other hand, the editors are to some extent right in their somewhat laboured defence of Froude as being anti-Romanist as much as anti-Protestant. They point to an answer to a friend's remark, that if the Romanists were schismatics in England, they were Catholics abroad; 'No, they are wretched Tridentines everywhere.' And again: 'I could never become a Romanist; I should never be able to believe that everything in Pope Pius' confession of faith is necessary for salvation.' But it was apparently only after his Mediterranean journey, and its discouraging experiences of Catholicism in its native land, that he reached this view. He finds that the Romanists really are idolaters.[5] At the famous meeting of Newman and himself with Monsignor Wiseman at Rome he was disagreeably surprised to find that nothing could take place in the direction of communion with Rome 'without swallowing the whole Council of Trent,'[6] and this contributes to alter completely his idea of Catholicism, and makes him 'desire a

[1] *Remains*, vol. i. p. 433.
[2] *Ibid.* vol. i. p. 387.
[3] *Ibid.* vol. i. p. 188.
[4] *Ibid.* vol. i. pp. 307, 435.
[5] *Ibid.* vol. i. p. xiii.
[6] *Ibid.* vol. i. p. 306.

complete overthrow of their system.' 'I believe that the only τόπος now is the old Church of England, and as an explanation of what one means, Charles I and the Non-Jurors.'[1] There is in effect much that favours the assumption that Froude was the first of the Oriel friends to conceive the thought of an Anglican *via media*, which Newman was later to carry out dialectically. That Newman's development was to a great extent influenced by Froude, we have himself as witness: 'It is difficult to recount the direct additions to my creed which I received from this friend, to whom I owe so much. He taught me to regard with admiration the Roman Church, and in the same degree to harbour dislike of the Reformation. He imprinted deep in me the idea of devotion to the Blessed Virgin, and led me step by step to believe in the Real Presence.'[2] Probably this refers chiefly to the time before the Mediterranean journey: the friendship between Newman and Froude grew up, approximately, in 1829.[3]

The feeling of chivalrous adventure, which gives a certain charm to the Oxford Movement in its earliest stage, comes chiefly from Froude. But he was a soul which never had time to ripen. From 1831 it became plain that he was suffering from phthisis. He was sent abroad first to the Mediterranean, and afterwards (1834) to the West Indies. His death (February 28, 1836) was long expected. The consciousness of the short reprieve granted to him explains, perhaps, in many cases the zeal which makes him overshoot the mark. 'His thought is hot as if with the fever that shortened his days.'[4] One might

[1] *Remains*, vol. i. p. 308.

[2] *Apologia*, p. 87 (1908, p. 25). Previously he has characterised Froude's view, described his devotion to a hierarchic system, and a free Church, how he 'gloried in accepting Tradition as a main instrument of religious teaching,' his severe view of the meaning and value of virginity, his reverence for saints and his embracing of the ideal of holiness. But at the same time he had no aptitude and no liking for theology in its proper sense.

[3] In a letter of September 7, 1828, to R. I. Wilberforce, Froude says of Newman: 'He is a fellow that I like more, the more I think of him; only I would give a few odd pence if he were not a heretic' (*Remains*, vol. i. p. 232). This was written before Newman was converted to High Church principles.

[4] Fairbairn, *Catholicism, Roman and Anglican* (London, 1899), p. 296. Here we may quote a contribution by J. A. Froude to the characteristics of his brother: 'My brother did not live to be taught the difference between fact and speculation. Taught it he would have been if time had been allowed him. No one ever recognised facts more loyally than he when once he saw them' (*Short Studies* (1912), vol. v. p. 179).

add that the pages of his ' Remains,' in spite of the justifiable offence they caused, have a peculiar stamp of the, as it were, transfigured spirituality which the disease from which he suffered so often seems to bestow on its victims.

It is stated that Froude, with death impending before his eyes, declared that, if he had ever done a good deed in his life, it was that he taught Newman and Keble to understand each other.[1] It is scarcely necessary here to dwell on the importance which Newman's relation to Keble had both for him personally and for the development of the Neo-Anglican movement. In other connections we have studied Keble as the connecting link between literary romanticism and the Oxford Movement. It has been pointed out how the old High Anglican tradition lives on in him.[2] It is chiefly Keble's central position in Neo-Anglicanism which gives us the right to regard it as fundamentally a continuation of Caroline Anglicanism, though the foreign elements it took up and assimilated during its development led it farther away from its source. It is typical that Keble's chief literary work in the thirties was an edition of Hooker,[3] with an introduction in which his attempt to explain away and modify Hooker's freer conception of Church government, especially the significance of the episcopate and its necessity, throws a clear light upon the actual difference between the ' apostolicals ' of the thirties and the old broad-minded classic of Anglicanism.[4] We have also seen how it was his sermon on ' National Apostasy ' that primarily caused Newman to describe him as

[1] *Remains*, vol. i. p. 438.

[2] The most important works on Keble are: J T. Coleridge, *A Memoir of the Rev. John Keble* (2 vols., Oxford and London, 1869); W. Lock, *John Keble, a Biography* (3rd ed., London, 1893); E. Wood, *John Keble* (' Leaders of the Church '; London, 1909).

[3] *The Works of Richard Hooker, New Edition, arranged by John Keble* (Oxford, 1836).

[4] Keble's Preface, pp. lxx–lxxvii. He explains the difference between Hooker's conception and that of Caroline Anglicanism chiefly in that the former felt himself obliged to have regard to contemporaries who were not ripe for the whole Apostolic truth; ' he did not feel at liberty to press unreservedly, and to develop in all its consequence, that part of the argument which they, taught by the primitive Church, regarded as the most vital and decisive: the necessity, namely, of the Apostolic commission to the derivation of sacramental grace, and to our mystical communion with Christ ' (p. lxxvii).

the real author of the whole movement. Even if this is justified, his influence on its development was more indirect. He joined in contributing to the series of Tracts,[1] but his absence from actual headquarters gave him no opportunity to intervene personally in the development of events. But perhaps his loneliness in the country, and the pastoral activity which was the reason of it, contributed to develop the traits of character which would give him his special part in the history of the movement; chiefly the conservative trait of his nature, and along with it the inflexible firmness which lay deep in his personality, under the gentle and amiable poetic nature which is expressed in 'The Christian Year.' The radiant saintliness which shone round the once so promising University teacher who, giving up all ambition, devoted himself entirely to the charge of his little country parish, gave added weight to his appearance when later he visited the scene of his youthful academic triumphs. He was the strongest character among the leaders, and the others got counsel and strength from him. It was especially this quality that fitted him, during the critical time that dates from Newman's secession, to hold firmly to the course he had begun, and to help many wavering and uncertain souls, chiefly by correspondence.[2] Even his comrades among the leaders sought him as spiritual director. But his remoteness in the country certainly was unfavourable to his spiritual growth. From his first appearance one can hardly trace any development in him. His thoughts moved within a narrow sphere, and he was altogether incapable of entering into the ideas of others. All opinions differing from the traditional, and all the fresh gains of the age in the region of thought and enquiry seemed to him to be sinful inventions.[3]

At the beginning of the Tractarian Movement, Edward Bouverie Pusey was still at a distance from the triumvirate

[1] Keble wrote Tracts Nos. 4, 13, 40, 52, 54, 57, 60, 89.

[2] Collected with the title *Letters of Spiritual Counsel and Guidance*, ed. R. F. Wilson (3rd ed. 1875).

[3] Cp. J. A. Froude, *Short Studies*, vol. v. p. 192. But he was not alone among contemporary theologians in taking the account of Creation in its literal form, or believing that the fossils, which the geology of the day began to use as arguments against the Mosaic account, were deposited in the mountains just as they were by the hand of the Creator (J. Hunt, *Religious Thought in England in the Nineteenth Century* (London, 1896), p. 164).

just described.[1] But it was he, more than anyone else, not even Keble excepted, who preserved the Anglican character of the movement, not only during the critical years which preceded Newman's secession, but also after this heavy blow. His character has also been sketched in our introductory study. Born in 1800, Pusey belonged to a rich and cultivated family of landowners—his father was the youngest son of a viscount, and his mother was also of noble birth. Thus, from his infancy he was fitted into the fabric of the English community, of which the Established Church was a part, far more firmly than Newman. The spirit of his home was religious, with Evangelical leanings. He gave early proof of a great receptive ability, combined with that trait of gentle amiability, which he persistently maintained. To the bringing up in the home of his fathers was added the best education that could be got: from Eton he went as a student to Christ Church; as Fellow of Oriel in 1823 he first came in contact with Newman, though only later years brought full intimacy.[2] It was Dr. Lloyd, as Regius Professor of Theology, who exercised the strongest influence on Pusey, and it was at his suggestion that he undertook his journey to Germany. This largely contributed to his acquiring a solid learning and a certain breadth of view which, in the twenties, was enough to give him an appearance of liberalism, but which was only too soon

[1] Pusey's life has been exhaustively described by H. P. Liddon, *Life of E. B. Pusey*, 4 vols. (1893–97), after the death of the author completed by J. O. Johnston, R. J. Wilson, and W. C. E. Newbolt.

[2] In his diary (May 17, 1824) Newman, in his picture of Pusey, depicts his own religious standpoint at the time: 'That Pusey is Thine, O Lord, how can I doubt? His deep views of the Pastoral office, his high ideas of the spiritual rest of the Sabbath, his devotional spirit, his love of the Scriptures, his firmness and zeal all testify to the operation of the Holy Ghost; yet I fear he is prejudiced against Thy children.' [Pusey had anticipated Newman in discarding the Evangelical opinions of his childhood.] 'Let me never be eager to convert him to a *party* or to a form of *opinion*. Lead us both in the way of Thy commandments. What am I that I should be so blessed in my near associates?' (*Letters and Correspondence*, vol. i. p. 117; ed. 1903, vol. i. p. 103). Pusey, however, always understood Evangelicalism better than the other Oxford men (cp. Oakeley, *The Tractarian Movement* (London, 1865), p. 49). It is certainly not without justification when Liddon argues that Pusey received abiding impressions from German pietism (*Life of Pusey*, vol. ii. p. 307). Perhaps one might venture to use the term 'objectivized pietism' to describe the tone of deep personal religion which runs through even Pusey's High Church writings. Later there were united with this influences from ascetic quarters, particularly in the modern French Church.

narrowed. It was also Lloyd's recommendation which in early life procured for him the post of Regius Professor of Hebrew, to which chair a Canonry of Christ Church was annexed: in the same year he had married, and his home in Christ Church was often to be a welcome resort for his friend from Oriel, who was also to be his chief comforter when the domestic happiness was crushed by Mrs. Pusey's early death (1839).

At the beginning of the thirties Pusey was more than anything else the retired scholar, entirely occupied with his Arabic MSS. in the Bodleian Library. His sympathies in Church matters had, chiefly through Lloyd's influence, become predominantly High Church. But perhaps we have to regard as the bridge which carried him over into the Tractarian camp the longing for holiness, which was at the bottom of his as of Newman's religion, and which with both binds together their religious attitude in youth and later life. Liddon is doubtless right when he says that the movement, in which they both took part, was above all a warning to holiness, and he has also pointed to the interesting fact that not only Pusey's, but one of Newman's first printed sermons is written on the same text (Heb. xii. 14, 'Holiness without which no man shall see the Lord'), and they treat of the same subject.[1] But the analysis of the importance of the yearning for holiness in the history of Tractarianism cannot be undertaken now. It must be postponed till we come to describe the special nature of their piety.

[1] Liddon, *Life of Pusey*, vol. i. p. 144.

## CHAPTER IX

### THE FIRST ATTACK AND THE GOLDEN AGE OF VIA MEDIA

THE history of the Oxford Movement has often been related, and in the matter of its actual course no uncertainty exists. It is not our intention here to add one more chronicle to the number of those already written. Yet it seems necessary here to give a summary sketch of the events, with the chief emphasis laid, on the one hand on what I might call the literary monuments of the movement, the rich remains of a controversy that was chiefly waged with the pen—a general survey of the literature on the movement is given in an appendix—and on the other hand on those divergences within it which brought about the catastrophe.

The twelve years of the original Oxford Movement may fitly be divided into three periods: (1) 1833–35, the early stages; (2) 1835–39, a time of deepening during which the positions are all established and defended: one might call these years the golden age of *Via Media*, though already antagonisms begin to be distinguished; (3) 1839–45, the time of breaking up and crisis. The nature of the subject makes it necessary to devote to this last phase a more thorough treatment than to the earlier, during which the inner tension was still concealed, and when only an even advance seems to present itself. But this must not make us blind to the fact that the inner development which runs through all these three stages is perhaps most deeply determined by the growing opposition between two elements. I will call them the static and the progressive. The static is represented by the effort to go back to the past—*stare super antiquas vias*—to restore and maintain a form of Church and religion which it was believed could be found in its purest form in a certain phase of the development

of the English reformed Church and earlier in the primitive Church. H. J. Rose and W. Palmer are typical of this endeavour. Keble and Pusey form a mediating centre, as they are too much touched by the new element to belong entirely to the former. But in a later phase Keble at least represents the static element in the movement. The progressive element has a far greater religious elasticity. Ecclesiastical form becomes a matter of secondary importance, and the choice of such a form is conditioned less by the aesthetic, intellectual, and traditional considerations which are determining factors for so many, than by an exclusively and intensely religious claim. Deepest lies the longing for holiness, of all conceivable motives perhaps that which is most central to religion. A particularly judicious reader of Newman's 'Apologia' has observed, that if everything in the world, especially truth, has to give way to religion, the natural result is Roman Catholicism.[1] Herein is the explanation of much of the power of attraction which Romanism has shown itself to have, particularly for the representatives of progressive Neo-Anglicanism. It has already been pointed out how to many of them Anglicanism was only a resting-place on the road that led from Evangelicalism to Rome. But this does not merely explain the shaping of individual destinies: it also makes it conceivable how this progressive Neo-Anglicanism would in the end endeavour gradually to remodel its own Church after the pattern of Rome: it has, at least to some extent, nobler reasons than a simple desire to imitate. In spite of its partiality it is the progressive element in Neo-Anglicanism which created a religious type of a special kind and significance for Church history.

In the first stage of the Oxford Movement it is the static element which appears most plainly in the aims and objects that centre round the meeting at Hadleigh. It does not seem that any full agreement was reached between the men (W. Palmer, Perceval, Froude) who met Rose at his Rectory at Hadleigh, July 25–29, 1833, to take counsel about the critical state of the Church; but out of this meeting arose a plan for a league in defence of the Church, which in execution was altered, so that instead a combined address with about 7000

[1] A. F. Hort in *Life and Letters*, vol. ii. p. 18.

clerical signatures was presented to the Archbishop of Canterbury in February 1834.[1] This was followed up by a lay address from 230,000 fathers of families. At the same time a programme was formulated at Hadleigh which may be regarded as typical of the static Anglican conception of the Church. It is most explicitly contained in a little catechism entitled 'The Churchman's Manual, or Questions and Answers on the Church, on Protestant and Romish Dissenters, and Socinians,'[2] with a short formulation of five points, in which, on the basis of the doctrine of Apostolic Succession—which here for the first time takes up a dominant position—the demand is developed for the freedom and spiritual immunity of the Church. In contrast we find the progressive element in the 'Tracts for the Times,' which gave the movement the name *tractarian*; this, at first applied in mockery, was afterwards accepted in the terminology of Church history. The 'Tracts' were Newman's work. His letters of this period energetically stated his reasons against the plan of an Association,[3] and in 'Apologia' he confesses with scarcely concealed pride that the initiative to the 'Tracts' was his own, and he repeats his expressions in a letter to Palmer about the importance of the individual for the furtherance of a cause.[4] The antagonism was still concealed under alliance. But the difference was great, in the one case the dead limb of a respectable Church policy, in the other a young living devotion, which even when it builds with old stones has the power of new creation.

The first three 'Tracts,' all from Newman's pen, are dated September 9, 1833. It is particularly to these that Keble's words apply when he says that 'the earlier tracts were written as when one gives the alarm of a fire or a deluge,

[1] For the Hadleigh conference and the discussions connected with it see Mathieson, *English Church Reform*, p. 86, which also deals with Palmer's plan of an association. The contents of the two addresses are summarised on pp. 95 f.

[2] *A Collection of Papers connected with the Theological Movement of* 1833, edited by A. P. Perceval (2nd ed., London, 1843).

[3] See, *e.g.*, a letter to J. W. Bowden of November 13, 1833.

[4] 'No great work was done by a system; whereas systems rise out of individual exertions. Luther was an individual. The very faults of an individual excite attention: he loses, but his cause (if good, and he powerful-minded) gains' (*Apologia*, p. iii; ed. 1908, p. 42).

to summon the attention of all who hear him.' Especially the first tract, 'Thoughts on the Ministerial Commission,' has something of the metallic sound of a trumpet-blast.[1] It is written with a manly conciseness, and gives good proof how ripe already was the mastery of style in its author. 'To my brothers in the sacred ministry, presbyters and deacons of the English Church, ordained thereto by the Holy Ghost and imposition of hands.' Thus was the flag raised from the start. 'Fellow-labourers, I am but one of yourselves, a Presbyter; and therefore I conceal my name. . . . Yet speak I must; for the times are very evil, yet no one speaks against them.' Then follows an admonition to stand up in support of the Bishops against the evil times as 'their shield-bearers . . to be to them what Luke and Timothy were to St. Paul'—yet without usurpation of their sacred office—'and black event as it would be for the country, yet . . . we could not wish them a more blessed termination of their course, than the spoiling of their goods and martyrdom.'

On what shall the priesthood base its claim to respect and attention? Not on birth, connections, popularity, but only on this: 'our apostolic descent.' 'We have been born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh nor of the will of man, but of God. The Lord Jesus Christ gave His Spirit to His Apostles: they in their turn laid their hands on those who should succeed them; and these again on others; and so the sacred gift has been handed down to our present Bishops, who have appointed us as their assistants and in some sense representatives.' An analysis of the ritual for the ordaining of deacons and priests in the Anglican Church follows to confirm this. Every ordained priest has, by the very form in which he has received his office, recognised the Apostolic Succession. So the tract ends in an appeal to the author's brethren to be serious with, to 'make much' of the gift. 'Speak out now, before you are forced. . . . A notion has gone abroad that they can take away your power. They think they have

[1] 'If the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to the battle?' is the motto of the first collected volume of *Tracts* issued in 1840. The authors' names are not given; only No. 18 has Pusey's initials. A list of the *Tracts* with authors' names may be found in Liddon's *Life of Pusey*, vol. iii. pp. 473–480, and in S. Hall, *A Short History of the Oxford Movement* (London, 1907), pp. 140–147.

given, and can take it away. They think it lies in the Church property, and they know that they have politically the power to confiscate that property. They have been deluded into a notion that present palpable usefulness, producible results, acceptableness to your flocks, that these and such like are the tests of your Divine Commission. Enlighten them in this matter. Exalt our Holy Fathers the Bishops, as the Representatives of the Apostles and the Angels of the Churches. And magnify your office, as being ordained by them to take part in their Ministry.' Finally there is an urgent warning in any case to choose a party and take a side.

The other contemporary tract, 'The Catholic Church,' directly deals with the Irish Church question. 'Has the State created us and can it destroy us?' It is the same as if the Roman State had appointed Bishops in the Apostles' time, and in what respect is the English State at present unlike the Roman of that time? The comparison bears witness to the author's perfervid state of feeling. He continues in a calmer spirit to develop the Article of the 'one Catholic and Apostlic Church' as identical with the visible Church. The final phrase, 'To prepare for persecution may be the way to avert it,' has doubtless an universal validity, but to what degree it is applicable to the case in question, it is beyond our judgment to say.

Before the end of the year twenty tracts appeared, nine of them by Newman himself, most of them principally on the same theme—we may only mention No. 7, 'The Episcopal Church Apostolical'—and No. 11 and No. 20, containing three letters on the 'Visible Church.' Of the other writers we notice J. Keble, who contributed two numbers, the first No. 4, 'Adherence to the Apostolic Succession the Safest Course'—the style here notably contrasts with the metallic sound of Newman's; it is the weaker instrument that plays, but the melody is the same; in No. 12 his brother Thomas Keble begins a continuous narrative which takes up four numbers. It is a country clergyman, who by Socratic method entices out of a parishioner the fulness of Apostolic doctrine. J. W. Bowden, Newman's oldest Oxford friend, his companion in the earliest student years at Trinity College, contributed one tract, R. H. Froude two. Three are by persons who do not play any conspicuous part in the movement later (one by J. A. Menzies, two by

B. Harrison). Two have their special history. The fifteenth tract, 'On the Apostolical Succession in the English Church,' was originally written by W. Palmer, who however would not have anything to do with the series but only placed the material at Newman's disposal. He made use of it for the sake of the good cause, though he could not fully endorse Palmer's line of argument. This mode of procedure brought on him serious reproaches from Froude, who based on this an accusation of what he called *economy*, an expression which later was taken up by the enemies of the movement and regarded as containing a proof of Jesuitical dealing on a large scale. The eighteenth tract, 'On the Benefits of the System of Fasting, enjoined by our Church,' was written by Pusey, who, though in sympathy with the thoughts hitherto brought forward in the series, would not join the coterie which was responsible for it. According to the account of an eye-witness,[1] Pusey, half in jest, reproached Newman with his irreconcilable attitude to 'the peculiars' —Newman's nickname for Evangelicals — and declared his intention of writing something with a more placable intent. Newman was instantly desirous of getting it for the Tracts, and finally Pusey conceded on condition that by adding his initials he should make a distinction between his tract and the others which were unsigned. The result was the opposite of the intention: Pusey's name was the first that became generally known and connected with the series, and thus the word *Puseyism* was coined, which soon was to get a not altogether deserved notoriety. It may, however, also be pointed out that it was through Pusey that the ascetic motive was treated for the first time.

The next year continued what the first began, on much the same lines. The most important of the thirty numbers which came out in 1834 are undoubtedly the two by Newman, entitled 'Via Media' (38 and 41).[2] They are in dialogue form: Clericus defends himself to Laicus against accusations of *popery*. He builds on the dualism of Prayer Book and Articles

[1] *Autobiography of Isaac Williams*, pp. 70 f.; Liddon's *Life of Pusey*, vol. i. p. 279.

[2] These are reprinted in a collection of essays, which were issued in two volumes in 1839, and then as a whole entitled *The Via Media of the Anglican Church*. The first part has an independent title, *Lectures on the Prophetical Office of the Church viewed relatively to Romanism and Popular Protestantism.*

and urges a new reformation, which should bring to light the true principles of the Church. We find here a clear and classical expression of the earlier Tractarian attitude, as to some extent it was maintained by the centre of the party. Clericus does not wish entirely to separate himself from 'the Reformed Churches on the Continent,' but he declares 'that it is the honour of the English Church that it has chosen the so-called Via Media. It lies between the so-called Reformers and the Romanists.' Simply in passing we may recall how we found the same thoughts in A. Knox and J. Jebb.

These earlier 'Tracts' often have a strongly anti-Roman tone. Thus, *e.g.* in No. 20, Newman's third letter on the visible Church, which says that every thought of union with Rome is impossible. 'Their communion is infected with heterodoxy: we are bound to flee it, as a pestilence. They have established a lie in the place of God's truth; and by their claims of immutability in doctrine they cannot undo the sin they have committed. They cannot repent. Popery must be destroyed: it cannot be reformed.'

This is the forerunner of Newman's writings more deeply hostile to Rome, which belong to the second period of the movement. One may wonder to what extent the vehemence of the anti-Roman tone is an unforced expression of the author's feeling. He certainly states in 'Apologia' how strongly the anti-papal zeal of strict evangelicalism coloured his imagination. But it is credible that hostility to Rome was also somewhat emphasised, and anyhow retained longer than it otherwise would have been—by reason of the situation at the moment. The controversy over Catholic Emancipation had given an actuality to the questions of relations with Rome and produced an exasperation of feeling, and Anglican scholars had searched for all manner of weapons out of the armoury of old polemical writings against Rome.[1]

Besides the original writers, some new ones appear during the year: one of these, C. P. Eden, author of No. 32, never belonged to the Tractarian stock. A. P. Perceval, however, who wrote Tracts 23, 35, and 36, was at this time one of Newman's warmest supporters. He had been at the Hadleigh conference, and later published his collection of

[1] This is kindly pointed out to me by Dr. E. W. Watson, Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History at Oxford.

documents on the history of the movement, which is specially important for this episode.[1] What, however, most strikes one, as one sees the list of tracts for 1834, is the great number of reprints from old Anglican theologians, in conception, if not all in date, Caroline, who, to the Oxford men, stood out as the classical Fathers of the Church. As many as eleven reprints appear in 1834. First comes Bishop Beveridge in Nos. 25 and 26;[2] 'The Great Necessity and Advantage of frequent Communion.' That also Cosin's[3] 'Historia Transubstantiationis papalis' appeared in an English translation (Nos. 27, 28) is a noticeable sign how conscious Newman and his followers were at this time of antagonism to Rome and of the necessity of emphasising this point. The other reprints are all from Bishop Wilson's writings.[4] His 'Meditations on his Sacred Office' ran through seven numbers, four during 1834.

During the first half of 1835, which is to be counted in the first period of the movement, R. H. Froude appears for the last time in the series with 'Church and State' (No. 59), and 'The Antiquity of the Existing Liturgies' (No. 63): and among the reprints occurs the name of Bishop Bull.[5] These reprints show the beginning of the attempt to connect closely the thoughts, which to many seemed novel, with the genuine tradition of the national Church, an attempt which was soon to appear still more clearly.

[1] Perceval, who was chaplain to William IV and Victoria, used his position to advocate the Oxford Movement at Court.

[2] William Beveridge (1637–1708), Bishop of St. Asaph, was closely akin to the first Non-Jurors.

[3] John Cosin (1594–1672), Bishop of Durham, was one of the strongest characters of the older Caroline school, more anti-Roman and Protestant than most of the Laudian type.

[4] Thomas Wilson (1663–1755), Bishop of Sodor and Man, one of the last and most attractive representatives of old High Anglicanism, whose breadth of view and understanding of different religious bodies, whether Roman or Protestant, was by no means transferred to his Anglican admirers. Keble published his collected writings in the *Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology*, and devoted sixteen years to writing his biography.

[5] George Bull (1634–1710), Bishop of St. David's, resembled Beveridge. He was one of the most learned representatives of the school. His *Defensio Fidei Nicaenae* was praised by Bossuet, and for his work *Judicium Ecclesiae Catholicae* he received congratulations from the whole French clergy—though they were surprised at the Protestant theologian using the term Catholic. Bull put a stop to their joy by a work on *The Corruptions of the Church of Rome*. Robert Nelson wrote his life, and the Non-Jurors regarded him as one of their teachers.

In a survey which has in view chiefly the literary side, the Tracts must stand in the forefront during this earlier epoch. This period was the most definitely Tractarian, since the pamphlets, of little weight but considerable acuteness, followed thick on each other, sixty-five of the ninety coming out in the time in question. The irregular manner in which they appeared caused various difficulties. Though Newman's faithful henchmen, sometimes as in the case of T. Mozley on horseback, scattered the dragon-seed far and wide in Anglican parsonages, the undertaking would not prosper as a speculation in the book-trade, and more than once the publishers thought of bringing them to a close for this reason. But alongside of the Tracts what was written in the *British Magazine* had its effect on the public in general. This journal had been founded by H. J. Rose as an organ for his plans of Church restoration. In it began to appear, at the same time as the earlier Tracts, the sketches by Newman which were later collected in the volume 'The Church of the Fathers'; in it appeared in 1836 his 'Home Thoughts Abroad,' echoes of the Italian tour and particularly impressions from the monuments of Christian Rome.[1] In it also were first read the poems, later collected in 'Lyra Apostolica.' Finally the purely personal influence of the leader—at this time there was properly only one—made itself felt in a way which in future would mean more than propaganda outside. It was felt in the first instance by the group of friends, chiefly of Oriel, who were joined together in the greatest intimacy, and formed a kind of nucleus. It will be enough here to mention the brothers Mozley, Thomas and James,[2] R. I.

[1] In 1885 Newman described these sketches as the first attempt to 'turn men's minds from the classic memories and art treasures of Rome to its Christian associations' (*Letters and Correspondence*, vol. i. p. 391).

[2] The name of Mozley is indissolubly bound up with the Oxford Movement. Thomas (1803–93), the elder brother, author of the memoirs already often quoted, became Fellow of Oriel in 1829. He won greater reputation as journalist than as theologian or priest, and finally devoted himself entirely to this calling. In 1836 he married Newman's sister Harriet. For a time attracted to Rome, he nevertheless remained in the English Church. His younger brother, James Bowling (1813–79), was more important. After several failures he won a fellowship at Magdalen in 1840; from a country parish he passed to be Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford in 1871. His sister Anne edited his *Letters* (1884), with a memoir, and (1890) *Letters and Correspondence of J. H. Newman during his life in the English Church.*

Wilberforce,[1] and Frederic Rogers,[2] and outside Oriel, especially the gentle poet, Isaac Williams of Trinity.[3] Newman's influence affected wider circles by his Sunday sermons in St. Mary-the-Virgin. All witnesses agree in ascribing to them a unique importance.[4] Through them the movement became, what it really was, a religious movement. We shall have occasion to come back to this point of view in another context. Here it only remains to record that Newman's first sermons, the first volume of 'Parochial and Plain Sermons,' appeared in 1834 with a dedication to Pusey.

The second period of the movement, extending from 1835 to 1839, is a time when it was led out into deeper and more troubled waters than before. It is a time of deepening and progress, but also a time of controversies, which caused the opposite tendencies within the camp to appear, each of which helped to bring on the great crisis. First by an appendix to his earlier tract on fasting, and then by his great dissertation, 'Scriptural Views of Holy Baptism,' published in three Tracts (67–69), Pusey definitely entered the Tractarian camp. The importance of this is best described in Newman's own words: 'He at once gave to us a position and a name. Without this we should have had no chance, especially at the early date of 1834, of making any serious resistance to the Liberal aggression. . . . There was henceforth a man who could be the head and centre of the zealous people in every part of the country, who were adopting the new opinions. . . . Dr. Pusey was a

[1] Robert Isaac (1802–57), second son of William Wilberforce, became Fellow of Oriel in 1826, held an Anglican living for twenty years, went over to Rome in 1854, died in Rome while studying theology three years later, and is buried in Sta Maria sopra Minerva.

[2] F. Rogers (1811–89), later Lord Blachford, remained a layman, distinguished himself as politician and civil servant, and in 1846 founded the *Guardian* as an organ for the Tractarian ideas. His correspondence (*Letters of Frederic Lord Blachford*, ed. G. E. Marindin; London, 1896) contains much that is of interest.

[3] Isaac Williams (1811–65) was Keble's pupil, both in poetry and theology. He became Fellow of Trinity in 1831. At this time his verses appeared chiefly in the *British Magazine*. Later he published partly long poems—*The Cathedral* (1838), *The Baptistery, or the Way of Eternal Life* (1842), and *The Altar* (1847)—partly some collections of short spiritual poems, among them a series of translations from the Paris Breviary (1839). His autobiography has already been quoted.

[4] See, *e.g.*, the accounts brought together by Church, *Oxford Movement*, pp. 121–126.

host in himself; he was able to give a name, a form, and a personality to what was without him a sort of mob.'[1] The series of Tracts changes its character after Pusey's adhesion. It is striking that in the collected editions the forty-seven first tracts occupy the first part, the next twenty-three the second, while four volumes are taken up by the last twenty. More learned dissertations took the place of pamphlets. Pusey it was also who found a new form of bringing out the witness of the old Anglicanism for the benefit of the new. Instead of reprints of isolated works he collects with the title 'Catena Patrum' the statements of the fathers of his Church on certain questions. The first of these rather unwieldy 'Catenae' (No. 74) contains the authorities for the doctrine of 'Successio Apostolica' (April 25, 1836). The same year followed another containing quotations touching the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration which Pusey so warmly embraced. In 1837 two more came out, one (No. 78) on the principle *quod semper quod ubique* (which, however, Pusey did not himself compile), another (No. 81) entitled 'Testimony of Writers in the Later English Church to the Doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, with an Historical Account of the Changes in the Liturgy as to the Expression of that Doctrine': the sacrificial idea already demands its place. Among Newman's own contributions we notice a series of three Tracts 'Against Romanism,' but at the same time (No. 75, June 24, 1836) 'On the Roman Breviary as Embodying the Substance of the Devotional Services of the Church Catholic.' This sold well, but caused scruples in many quarters. This was to be still more the case with Isaac Williams' 'On Reserve in Communicating Religious Knowledge,'[2] to which we must return in another context. As editor of the third 'Catena Patrum' appeared two men whom we have not had occasion to name previously, but who when placed side by side are calculated to rouse peculiar reflections: H. E. Manning, who was to remain faithful to the Church of his fathers five years longer than Newman, but later as *L'Inglese italianato* was to be the ablest advocate of the dogma of Infallibility at the Vatican Council, and in his

[1] *Apologia*, p. 137 (ed. 1908, p. 62).

[2] Parts I.–III. (No. 80), but undated; a final part was printed in 1840 as Tract 87.

native land to destroy Newman's attempt to build up a British Catholicism,[1] acting in the interest of Ultramontanism, was the one; the other was Charles Marriott, the retiring rather awkward scholar, whose noble character, self-sacrificing industry, and unalterable fidelity to his Church and his University made him an invaluable ally to the great genius who won his unlimited devotion, J. H. Newman, so long as the latter remained true to himself. Longer than others Marriott refused to regard the disaster of his secession as final.[2]

What a few years before had only been a very isolated group of friends had now grown into a party. The new ideas had become the inevitable subject of conversation wherever students or University men forgathered. The usual result followed, the danger of superficiality. Already the *Via Media* had begun to be filled with these young enthusiasts, whose spiritual emptiness their leader himself deplores.[3] In a letter of 1837 [4] he expresses his feeling of a 'danger, which at present threatens the apostolic movement, of becoming peculiar in external things, *i.e.* formalistic, artificial, "manneristic." Now Froude despised all outward show in religion. By losing him we have lost an important corrective.' We hear from another quarter how it became a sign of the true apostolic faith to walk

[1] H. E. Manning (1808–92) was for a short time Fellow of Merton, but spent his Anglican life first in a country parish and later as Archdeacon of Chichester. He was thus somewhat removed from Tractarianism proper, but ripened into High Church views, till several co-operating causes—Newman's influence, the death of his wife, and the Gorham case—brought about his secession in 1851. In 1865 he became Archbishop of Westminster, and in 1875 Cardinal. Purcell's *Life of Manning* (London, 1896) and a new biography by S. Leslie, *Henry Edward, Cardinal Manning* (1921), are quoted elsewhere.

[2] Charles Marriott (1811–58) was elected Fellow of Oriel in 1833. It was he who, along with Pusey, rescued the movement from shipwreck when Newman went over. In 1850 he became vicar of St. Mary-the-Virgin. His considerable learning was employed in thankless tasks which others heaped upon him, chiefly for the *Library of the Fathers*. His own writings are few and not specially original. But his deep personal piety helped to prevent the external elements from overpowering the purely religious side which was fundamental in the movement. For Marriott see specially Church, *The Oxford Movement*, pp. 77–81.

[3] 'The Via Media is crowded with young enthusiasts who never presume to argue except against the propriety of arguing at all' (from an essay, 'The State of Religious Parties,' in the *British Critic*, April 1839, quoted in *Apologia*, p. 183; ed. 1908, p. 95).

[4] To F. Rogers, July 5, 1837. *Letters*, vol. ii. p. 237 (ed. 1903, p. 212).

with your head somewhat awry, and when one reached one's place in the pew, to fall down on one's knees, as if the legs had suddenly been pulled away, just like Newman. A man of spiritual realities such as he was, must have been irritated by that sort of thing. At the same time he felt the overpowering need of thinking out and fixing the position which, by the force of circumstances, he felt constrained to take up, and which with the eloquence of an agitator he forced upon others, to orientate it upon the only fixed star he knew in the Church's firmament—Christian Antiquity—to which during the last year had been added another, though of lower degree, viz. Caroline Anglicanism. To this belonged a polemic on two fronts, which a wise general had to make as aggressive as possible, against Rome and against Geneva and its spiritual kin, among whom at times Luther is the recipient of a special attention, as a peculiar and dimly comprehended quantity.

In the dark side-chapel of St. Mary-the-Virgin, which is named after the founder of Oriel, Adam de Brome, Newman began to give public lectures, an unheard-of novelty in Oxford of that day. By these lectures active intellects were brought to concern themselves with the problems that occupied the lecturer. Here came too a few of 'Arnold's youths'—these began now to appear as a *tertium genus* in the University—to be accidentally attracted, as was A. P. Stanley, or like W. G. Ward to think out the consequences of the doctrine before the teacher, and act accordingly.

Accident influenced the choice of subject. A correspondence with the French Abbé Jager[1] was the origin of the series which was published in 1837 as 'Lectures on the Prophetical Office of the Church viewed relatively to Romanism and popular Protestantism.' Here polemic against Rome is in the foreground, a polemic which is unmatched for biting sharpness[2]—according to the author's own judgment this work was far more aggressive than the previously published Tract 71, 'On the Controversy with the Romanists.'[3] We cannot now go into the form in which he puts the central accusation of Tractarian

[1] *Letters*, vol. ii. pp. 74, 114 f. (ed. 1903, pp. 66, 102 f.).

[2] Bremond, *Newman*, p. 65: 'Je ne me rappelle pas avoir rien lu de plus suavement perfide, de plus spécieux, ni, au fond, de plus violent contre nous.'

[3] *Apologia*, p. 141 (ed. 1908, p. 64).

Anglicanism against Rome of having shown itself wanting in due reverence for Antiquity (by setting up in its place the contemporary chief organ of the Church as the ultimate authority), nor can we deal with the attack on what the author regards as the basic idea of Protestantism, the right of the individual to judge for himself in religious questions. Circumstances make the anti-Roman tendency come out most strongly, partly because it was regarded as opportune, not to say necessary for refuting those who already thought they smelt Popery in 'Tracts for the Times'—but the continuation of the series 'Against Romanism' (No. 79, 'On Purgatory') showed the beginning of a divergence between Newman and Pusey,[1] partly owing to their origin in the controversy with Abbé Jager. And when finally they were published in revised form, they were also meant to serve as an answer to the lectures delivered by Monsignor (afterwards Cardinal) Wiseman in London.

In Newman's collected writings these lectures form the first of two volumes entitled 'The Via Media of the Anglican Church,' while in the second volume, both Tracts with this name (38 and 41) are reprinted with the addition of a number of other writings.[2] An attempt, in the region of the central dogma, to maintain *Via Media*, this time chiefly against Lutheran Protestantism, is continued in the lectures 'On Justification' delivered 1837 and published next year, a more theological work than the former, and as far as I can see, having a greater right than it to take a central place in the unfortunately unwritten dogmatic history of Anglicanism. To the same category belong two other series of lectures, of which one came out as Tract 83, 'Advent Sermons on Anti-Christ' (June 29, 1830), the other as 85 in the same series (Aug. 24, 1830), 'Lectures on the Scripture Proof of the Doctrine of the Church,' one of the most noticeable of the Anglican treatises, which more than most of these makes us forecast the inner discord between modernism and mediaevalism, which alone can explain the riddle of his personality.

[1] Pusey thought Newman's attitude as to the practical consequences of the doctrine of Purgatory too moderate (Liddon, *Life of Pusey*, vol. ii. p. 7).

[2] Here we find Tract No. 71 and the famous Tract No. 90 with some of the treatises it produced, and finally Newman's *Retractation of Anti-Catholic Statements* of the year 1845.

The movement was also consolidated by the collection of the creations of ephemeral polemic in more permanent form. We may mention how the Tracts were subsequently reprinted and brought together into respectable volumes (the first was published in 1834 with an important preface); also how the poems printed during 1836 in the *British Magazine* were published as 'Lyra Apostolica,' which with all its unevenness and overstrung feeling is one of the most striking memorials of the youthful fervour which burned in these still anonymous authors.[1] The most important undertaking of all, which aimed at deepening and extending the principles, was 'The Library of the Fathers,' the idea of which appears in a letter of Newman in the year 1836.[2] At the beginning of 1838 three volumes were in the press.[3] The first part contained the 'Confessions of St. Augustine,' translated by Pusey. The original plan of putting out four volumes a year could not be executed, but Pusey's assiduous labour, assisted by Charles Marriott, carried the work forward. The work of translation was chiefly left to young helpers, while the leaders provided each part with prefaces.[4] The undertaking was completed in forty-seven years (three years after Pusey's death), in 1885, and then comprised 48 volumes.

Whatever one may think of the conception of history, in the interest of which the work was undertaken—it is the *monumentum aere perennius* of static Anglicanism—it evidences in a powerful manner how the revival of patristic study in England is directly based on the Oxford Movement. It is also an important evidence of the depth and seriousness in the work of exalting the Church at which it aimed, that such a work could not merely be executed but actually bought and read. It was

[1] The first six letters of the Greek alphabet were used as pseudonyms for Bowden, Froude, Keble, Newman, R. Wilberforce, and I. Williams. Considerably more than half are by Newman, many of the pieces written in the Mediterranean.

[2] He himself regards it as one of the most important events which took place in March 1836 (*Letters*, vol. ii. p. 177; ed. 1903, p. 158). In a letter of August 5 he says: 'Pusey and I think of giving our names as joint editors to a library of the Catholic Fathers, which will consist of translations from St. Austin, St. Chrysostom, etc. I am sure nothing will be like a good flood of divinity' (*ib.* vol. ii. p. 205; ed. 1903, p. 183).

[3] *Ibid.* vol. ii. p. 249 (ed. 1903, p. 223).

[4] A note on *Library of the Fathers*, with account of translation and authors of prefaces, is in Liddon's *Life of Pusey*, pp. 445 f.

to have a counterpart later in the 'Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology,' the plan of which Keble conceived in 1846.

In a letter of March 19, 1838,[1] Newman writes to a friend with a certain satisfaction about the mass of Catholic literature which is now being circulated. In the same year he himself, by taking over the *British Critic*, assured himself of a new organ (after two years T. Mozley succeeded him as editor), but it is chiefly other publications he has in view. He mentions with admiration W. Palmer's 'Treatises on the Church of Christ'; 'it will do a great deal of good, for just at this moment we need ballast,' and no one who has read the book can deny its suitability for the object. Further two historical works are quoted, H. Froude's 'Becket,' and a book on Hildebrand, which J. W. Bowden, to whom he was writing, had in hand.[2] As a counterweight to Palmer's heavy artillery he mentions Froude's 'Remains,' which also appeared this year. Their publication was soon to become one of the wedges which began to bring about the splitting of the Tractarian block. We must now look at it in this connection. The controversy over Froude's 'Remains' is the second of the three fatal crises which fall under this year, and of this we must now take a hurried survey.

We have previously been introduced to Dr. R. D. Hampden as one of the most learned representatives of the Noetic school, who in his Bampton Lectures of 1832 gave a conception, in some ways surprisingly modern, of the formulation of dogma as based on the philosophy of the day, which gave the vessels for the content of faith—a conception which drew no attention at the time, whether by reason of the obscurity of the language or a lack of understanding on the part of his hearers. In 1834 a proposal had been mooted to give Dissenters entrance to the University by abolishing the requirement of subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles (this was required in Oxford, but not in Cambridge). Hampden recommended this change in a pamphlet 'Observations on Religious Dissent.' In this he shows a disregard of the importance of dogmatic formulation altogether, which was bound to act as a direct challenge to Newman and his friends. Distinctions like the D.D. which

[1] *Letters*, vol. ii. p. 252 (ed. 1903, p. 225).

[2] Bowden's *Life of Pope Gregory the Seventh*, to write which he had been prompted by Froude through Newman, only appeared in 1840.

was given to Hampden *honoris causa*, increased the bitterness of feeling. When Hampden, supported by Whately and Arnold, ventured to propose in Convocation that subscription should be replaced by a more vague assent, he suffered a crushing defeat. This had the peculiar result that the Premier of the day, Lord Melbourne, an amateur theologian of Liberal leanings, appointed (1836) Hampden Regius Professor of Divinity. To see a man whose orthodoxy was so generally doubted—though it seems to have answered to fairly severe requirements, as seen from a later standpoint—in the chief theological chair of the English Church, which involved absolute authority in the granting of theological degrees, was regarded as a challenge in wide circles. When Newman took the lead of the opposition, he had the advantage of having behind him the whole weight of ecclesiastical conservatism both within and without the University. In his ' Elucidations of Dr. Hampden's Theological Statements,' he made an unmerciful use of the well-known controversial method of giving as unfavourable a combination as possible of passages taken out of their context in his opponent's writings. Pusey followed him with heavier weapons. It was the attack on Hampden which provoked Arnold to a violent counter-stroke in the well-known article in the *Edinburgh Review* for 1836, the bitterness of which was further increased by the title with which the editor headed it : ' The Oxford Malignants.' In this he poured the vials of his wrath on the ' Judaising party.'

The opposition in the University, powerless in face of the authoritative order of the Government, found an expedient for making known its dissatisfaction, the pettiness of which appears almost ridiculous to after-generations ; by a decree of Convocation, Hampden was deprived of the right of participation in the nomination of University preachers, because ' the University had no confidence in him in theological matters.' But if the Apostolic leaders were foremost in this matter, they share the responsibility for what was done with the majority of the University.

1838 was a critical year. Already in 1837 I. Williams' Tract (No. 80), ' On Reserve in communicating Religious Knowledge,' had caused widespread and quite undeserved commotion. Only malice could have based accusations of Jesuitism

on this cautious and romantically coloured exposition of the Oxford school's theory of religious knowledge. Far more natural was the storm which rose when Froude's friends took the unwise step of publishing the 'Remains,' and thus giving publicity to the effusions of this ardent but unripe young soul. Specimens have already been given of the contents of the work.[1] Partly as an answer to this book, the opposite party in Oxford put out a plan of erecting a monument to preserve the memory of the three reformers, Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer, who suffered martyrdom at Oxford, and thus put the Apostolicals into a difficult position, by giving them the choice between taking part in a demonstration, the Protestant colour of which must be hateful to them, and refusing to pay homage to the memory of the men who compiled the Prayer Book. Newman, Keble, and Pusey chose the latter course, Pusey only after much hesitation (he would not refuse his recognition to the Reformation, but felt unable to pay honour to the individual reformers). Pusey went into the matter thoroughly in correspondence with his Bishop, which ended in a public declaration in Pusey's 'Letter to the Bishop of Oxford,' published 1837. In this, in answer to the new accusation of Popery, which began to be more vociferous, he defined the standpoint of the Tractarian middle path.[2] But the 'Martyrs' Memorial' was erected, and as one enters from the north the mediaeval centre of the city, reminds us more of the theological controversy and quasi-Gothic architecture of the nineteenth century than of the religious heroes of the sixteenth.

These events had paved the way for, but not directly produced, the crisis of the movement, which in its essence was an internal crisis in its leaders. Newman had certainly felt himself seriously hurt when his Bishop, Bagot of Oxford, influenced by an anti-Tractarian agitation, which had already found vehement expression, mildly censured certain expressions of the Tracts in a pastoral letter. One who by his Church theory was bound to see in his diocesan the successor of the

[1] As a typical specimen of the indignation the book aroused we may quote an article by Sir James Stephen in the *Edinburgh Review* for 1838, 'Oxford Catholicism' (reprinted in *Essays in Ecclesiastical Biography*).

[2] See on this point Liddon, *Life of Pusey*, vol. ii. pp. 64–80.

Apostles and the Vicar of Christ could not but be affected by this.[1] Newman offered immediately to stop the series of Tracts, but the Bishop did not regard it as necessary. The Bishop's censure was one of the factors which shook the foundations of Newman's Anglicanism. How his position in the golden age of Via Media was gradually undermined, and how the whole movement in consequence underwent its fiery trial, requires a fuller discussion.

[1] *Apologia*, p. 157 (ed. 1908, p. 76) ; *Letters*, vol. ii. pp. 257–260 (ed. 1903, pp. 230–233) ; Liddon, *op. cit.* vol. ii. pp. 53 f.

# CHAPTER X

## THE CRISIS

NEWMAN himself has described the year 1839 as the climax of his Anglican career. 'In the spring of 1839 my position in the Anglican Church was at its height. I had supreme confidence in my controversial status, and I had a great and still growing success in recommending it to others.' He finds this period marked by an article of April 1839, the same which in his collected writings is entitled 'Prospects of the Anglican Church,' which is Newman's earliest attempt to sketch the history of the movement and state its relations to other currents of thought in his days.[1] It concludes with putting the ominous alternative: the Anglicanism of *Via Media*, or Roman Catholicism. That very year the author was himself to feel a dawning doubt in the choice between these two possibilities. His continued studies of the Roman Church taught him to distinguish between its doctrine as officially laid down, and its popular practice. But he sought in vain in Roman Catholic literature for a rejection of the popular excrescences, which could correspond to his own rejection of the Ultra-Protestantism that disfigured his own Church. On the dualism assumed between a genuine and a popular Catholicism his polemic in the following years is based.

At every Eucharistic Service he confessed the signs of the Church to be, in the words of the Nicene Creed, holiness, catholicity, and apostolicity. The controversy, purely as a matter of Church politics, turned on the latter: the sign of holiness was most decisive for a dialectic of the heart. The Anglican imputation against Rome was, that Rome lacked the mark of apostolicity and abandoned the ground

[1] *Essays Critical and Historical* (Longmans' edition, 1910), vol. i. pp. 263–308.

of the early Church. But could not Rome reply by denying the name of Catholic to the Church of England? Was not this Church a sect, cut off from communion with other branches of the Church? Thus Catholicity was opposed to Apostolicity.[1]

In the summer of 1839 Newman was occupied with the study of the Monophysite controversy. There the parallel with the divisions in the Church of his own time strikes him. 'My stronghold was Antiquity; nowhere in the middle of the fifth century I found, as it seemed to me, Christendom of the sixteenth and the nineteenth centuries reflected. I saw my face in that mirror, and I was a Monophysite.' Rome was then as now on the side of Catholicity and orthodoxy. Chalcedon answered to Trent. All his own arguments for *Via Media* were equally applicable to the heretics and schismatics of antiquity, Eutyches and Arius.[2]

He did not draw all these conclusions at once. But he had seen a warning hand on the wall. Then came a new impetus. Just then Wiseman began his activity in England, which was to be epoch-making in the history of the Roman Church in that country.[3] He had followed with attention the Oxford Movement from the first. In an article in the *Dublin Review* he drew a parallel between the Donatists and the Anglican Church. But it was really the use he made of St. Augustine's phrase, *securus judicat orbis terrarum*, that showed Newman the weight of the Roman claim to Catholicity as never before. 'By those great words of the ancient Father, interpreting and summing up the long and varied course of ecclesiastical history, the theory of the *Via Media* was absolutely pulverised.'[4]

[1] *Apologia*, p. 197 (ed. 1908, p. 105).

[2] *Ibid.* p. 209 (ed. 1908, p. 114); cp. Church, *op. cit.* p. 196.

[3] N. P. S. Wiseman, born in Seville 1802, was by birth half Irish and half Spanish. He acquired early considerable learning, and from 1827 worked at the English College in Rome, where Newman and Froude visited him on their Mediterranean journey. When, in 1839, Gregory XVI doubled the number of Vicars Apostolic in England he was sent there. His work was specially important as head of Oscott seminary, long the chief school of Catholic instruction in England. He became Cardinal in 1850, and also first Archbishop of Westminster, which he remained till his death in 1865. For Wiseman see W. Ward, *Life and Times of Cardinal Wiseman* (London, 1897), and an interesting sketch by H. Bremond in *L'Inquiétude religieuse* (Paris, 1909), vol. i.

[4] *Apologia*, p. 212 (1908, p. 117).

Actually he felt himself robbed of the platform on which he had hitherto felt himself safe, his Anglican theory of the Church. But the Protestant objections to the Roman system still remained, though the sharpness in their presentation was softened. He now certainly reckons with the possibility that Rome will in the long run be seen to have right on its side. The vehement polemic against Rome of the days of the *Via Media*, this polemic which was necessary for the system but aroused Hurrell Froude's special displeasure, has now given way to a markedly eirenic feeling, disturbed only by disgust at the political alliance of the English Catholics with the Liberals, and the Irish methods of propaganda.[1] Previously it was a question of maintaining a position taken up against other Churches by all the means of dialectic; now that enthusiasm for Church reunion begins to glow, which is perhaps the most important legacy of the Oxford Movement to later times.

But now more fatal than before is the effect of the narrowing of perspective, which excludes from view all sections of the Church but the Anglican and the Roman. The alternative has not yet been sharpened into a ruthless choice between two. Still the dream of a final union, brought about by the converging development of both, lives on. Two letters of September 1839 show how already the possibility dimly appears that he might be compelled at least to give up his clerical position in the Church of England: 'If the worst should happen, I should become Brother of Charity in London.'[2] In October he confesses to a friend that, for the first time since he began to prosecute theological studies, he sees a vista opened before him, of which he cannot see the end.[3]

However, he gathers up his somewhat damaged dialectic forces, and prepares to take up a new defence on a

[1] *Apologia*, p. 223 (1908, p. 124).

[2] To F. Rogers, September 15, 1839 (*Letters*, vol. ii. p. 285; ed. 1903, p. 255). There appears another, though subordinate, factor in his development: the Capuchin in Manzoni's *Promessi Sposi* struck him to the heart 'like a dagger.' The Italian Scott showed even popular Catholicism in a glorified light. In another letter to Rogers, September 22, he speaks of Wiseman's article: 'I must confess it has given me a stomach-ache. You see the whole history of the Monophysites has been a sort of alterative. And now comes this dose at the end of it. It does certainly come upon one that we are not at the bottom of things.'

[3] *Letters*, vol. ii. p. 287 (ed. 1908, p. 257).

narrower front. In the beginning of 1840 came out an article in the *British Critic*, 'On the Catholicity of the English Church,' his answer to Wiseman.

His correspondence in the winter of 1839–40 shows a growing unrest. The authorities in the Church and University show their displeasure more unmistakably. It seems plain that it is turning to a schism in the English Church between 'Peculiars' (Evangelicals and their partisans) and 'Apostolicals.'[1] So he sees the hosts of iniquity scaling the walls. It is a motley front: Thomas Carlyle, the Socialists, the Liberals in the Church (Arnold and Milman), the geologists, who are destroying the scientific authority of the Old Testament. Perhaps there cannot be found any religious power that is strong enough to withstand 'The league of evil' other than the Church of Rome?[2] Another circumstance is added, destined to play a fatal part. A radical fraction had grown up in his own party, and this not merely compromised the whole movement within the Church, but brought to light the latent differences between the Oxford conservatives with Pusey at their head and Newman on the other side. While they hid under his authority they drove him on to steps which otherwise perhaps would never have been taken.

The leader of this more radical fraction was W. G. Ward.[3] With him deserve to be mentioned F. W. Faber, J. D. Dalgairns, and F. Oakeley.[4] Ward, though not from Rugby,

[1] *Letters*, vol. ii. p. 297 (ed. 1908, p. 263).

[2] *Letters*, vol. ii. p. 300 (ed. 1908, p. 268): 'At the end of the first millenary it withstood the fury of Satan, and now the end of the second is drawing on'; cp. Newman's sketch, 'Reformation of the Eleventh Century' of 1841 in *Essays Critical and Historical*, vol. ii. p. 260.

[3] William George Ward's part in the movement has been described by his son, Wilfrid Ward, in *W. G. Ward and the Oxford Movement* (London, 1889).

[4] W. Ward, *op. cit., passim*; Church, *op. cit.* pp. 207, 321. F. W. Faber (1814–63) as an undergraduate won a reputation as a poet, left the Church of England the same year as Newman, after first having tried to practise in it various Roman usages (*e.g.*, the cult of the Sacred Heart), and became one of the foremost preachers of the Roman Catholic Church in England. J. D. Dalgairns (1818–76), of Scotch origin, did the Oxford School good service by his theological ability, and followed his master Newman into the Church of Rome in 1845. F. Oakeley (1802–80), as minister of Margaret Chapel in London, had been the first seriously to introduce Ritualism, which, though foreign to the earlier Oxford School, came to play so large a part in its later development. He also went over in 1845. He is a good example of how those brought up in Evangelicalism have least power of resistance to Rome.

had, during the first part of his time at Oxford, been counted with the school of Arnold, but soon sat loose to it, all the more as he was completely devoid of historical training and historical feeling. His acute intellect found more food in the philosophic radicalism of Bentham and Mill.[1] His special forte was Mathematics. A one-sided logical and dialectical talent was with him far more than with Newman a fundamental factor in his development, and it led him to a scepticism which brought him absolutely to deny the possibility of justifying a religious conviction by intellectual processes. But of his own intellectual ability he seems never to have had any doubts—a not uncommon inconsistency in professional sceptics—but just as with Newman, the intellect played only a subordinate part in relation to conscience. An inconstancy of temper, which hovered between deep melancholy and reckless jauntiness, combined with a warm religious vein, made it a necessity of life for him to find a counterpoise by systematic training of the moral sense. Holiness was to him, as to Newman, the sovereign motive of religion. But unlike Newman in not being bound by any historical considerations, only following the demand of logic for consistency, clearness, and completeness, he made it the one infallible divining-rod in his search for the religious body which could best satisfy his needs. This must be the one which above all others paid homage to the ideal of holiness, and favoured the ascetic training of the soul. It could not be doubtful how the search would end.

Ward was already predisposed to Rome before Newman came in his way. His premises were quite different from those which had hitherto determined the men of the Anglican revival. The Church of England had never possessed his heart. The romance of history was as strange to him as its reality. When his eyes were drawn to Rome, it was not the mighty phantom of the mediaeval Church which enchanted him, but the Roman Church of his own day, moulded by the Jesuits on the basis of Trent. In this there is a characteristic contrast between him and Hurrell Froude,

[1] Gladstone said once that Ward had to thank John Mill for more of his spiritual development than all the Anglican theologians together, with the single exception of Newman (Ward, *op. cit.* p. 60).

whom he so highly admired. While Patristics were as strange a country to him as classical High Anglicanism, he learned to love Suarez, Vasquez, and other leading casuists. In Loyola's 'Exercitia' he found help for the training of the will, which he recognised as the greatest need of his character; and when he helped Oakeley in his chapel in Margaret Street to celebrate Saints' Days and Holy Seasons with a liturgical pomp hitherto unheard of on Anglican soil, this had its reason not in Ritualistic snobbery but in the need of a soul torn by scepticism to get help from the symbols of worship in realising the spiritual reality, which only disappeared before the sword of thought. At the same time, the artistic woof in his nature made it easy for him to find expression for unspeakable things in the beauty of ritual.[1]

It seems a wonderful anomaly that Ward should belong to the English clergy and be a member of Balliol's teaching staff alongside of a man like Tait, the future archbishop. It was Newman's influence which checked him on the road to Rome. Now it was he who was gradually to force his master to finish the journey. For the present he had accepted his standpoint. It was now the hour of trial for the English Church. It had, like Rome, sinned and fallen. Could both win back their former glory and thus combine in one? In the face of such a view individual secessions seemed like shameful running away from the struggle for the great object.[2] Now the question was: Could the Church of England win back its 'Catholic' character? Was she not

[1] Already ritualism had raised its head, however strange it was to the real leaders of the Oxford Movement. Dr. Bloxam, Fellow of Magdalen, a close friend of its theological patriarch, Dr. Routh, represented this tendency. He was also in close relations with the Roman Catholic architect Pugin (Ward, *op. cit.* p. 153).

[2] This feeling had also been stimulated by individual advances from the Roman Catholic side. A convert to Rome from Evangelical Anglicanism, G. A. Spencer, later a Passionist, in 1840 had attempted to work in Oxford for an agreement that Romans and Anglicans should on a definite day pray for the reunion of their Churches. Newman, in spite of secret joy, had behaved stiffly, and refused to meet him at lunch: 'If R.C.'s and A.C.'s met together, it should be in sack-cloth rather than at a pleasant party' (Newman, *Letters*, vol. ii. pp. 295, 299 (ed. 1903, pp. 264, 267); *Apologia*, p. 224 (ed. 1908, p. 124); Liddon, *Life of Pusey*, vol. ii. pp. 127–135). Pusey eagerly took up the idea of mutual intercession, and succeeded, though only on a small scale, in bringing it about.

incurably compromised by the Protestant Articles she had made her confession of faith? It was this question to which he now demanded an answer from Newman.[1] The answer came in Tract 90, the most famous and last of the series.

In other ways the 'Tracts' had passed somewhat into the background during the last years. After Williams' much debated work 'On Reserve,' in 1837, we have previously noticed a 'Catena Patrum' by Pusey (No. 81), collecting Anglican statements on the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice. In 1838, besides a tract from T. Keble on the duty of the Anglican clergy to read Morning and Evening Prayer daily (No. 84), there were the two previously mentioned tracts by Newman. In 1839 there was only one tract (No. 86) in which I. Williams treats A. Knox's favourite theme, how a special protection of Providence can be traced in the destinies of the Anglican Liturgy ('Indications of a superintending Providence in the Preservation of the Prayer-Book and in the Changes which it has undergone'). In the following year he continued and completed his tract 'On Reserve' (No. 87). During this year, besides a selection, which Newman compiled and translated out of old Bishop Andrewes' Greek devotions (No. 88), there was only what is perhaps J. Keble's most important contribution to the series: 'On the Mysticism attributed to the Early Fathers of the Church' (No. 89). Here the ever-disputed word Mysticism aroused an attention which the author's temperate, though perhaps not clearly thought out, conception scarcely deserved. But the atmosphere was already charged.

Then came No. 90 as the spark to kindle the flame. It was dated 'The Feast of the Conversion of St. Paul' (January 25, 1841), but only published February 27.[2] The title was: 'Remarks on certain Passages of the Thirty-nine Articles.'[3] It starts from the postulate that the framers of the Articles of set purpose wished to form as broad a foundation as possible by indefiniteness of expression—a thesis which historically can scarcely be assailed; and further

[1] Tait's remark that 'Ward worried Newman into writing Tract 90' must contain some truth (Ward, *op. cit.* p. 152).

[2] Church, *The Oxford Movement*, p. 252.

[3] Reprinted in *Via Media*, vol. ii., where the most important consequential works are collected.

that the interpretation which is required to obtain an exact meaning in the vague language of the Articles, must have as its supreme standard the Catholic Church. The Articles could not intend to teach anything but the Catholic Faith, and in any case could not be in conflict with it. Thus the difficult question is broached, What is Catholic? and where is the dividing line between the Catholic and the specifically Roman? How much of the latter is definitely rejected in the Articles?

Newman distinguishes between three categories: (1) the Catholic—with this the Articles could not and did not conflict; (2) the official Roman doctrines so far as they were laid down by the Council of Trent; (3) the Vulgar Roman, popular usage, traditional glosses of the schools, protected by Rome's authority, but without the solemn sanction of the Church. This last is, he thinks, what the Articles mean by 'Romish' (as distinct from 'Roman'), *doctrina Romanensium*.[1]

It is clear that the Articles reject this category. But how do they stand to the second? In 1562 they could not aim at expressly rejecting the Tridentine decrees, which were promulgated two years later. Newman's object, of course, is to limit as much as possible the contradictions that can be found in this case. It is with this in view that he sets to work. He finds valuable assistance in the old Anglican homilies, to which the Articles themselves point, and which not seldom are found to give material for a 'Catholic' interpretation. Now it was a question of showing that the Articles 'permit, though they do not require, such an interpretation.' The result was a peculiar mixture of real acumen and equivocal special pleading.

It is not possible here to analyse the very comprehensive dissertation. Typical for the method is the treatment of purgatory, indulgences, images, relics, and invocation of Saints, of which Article XXII treats. The Article condemned 'the Romish doctrine' on these points. Newman draws the conclusion: not every doctrine about them, only the vulgar Roman. He shows by the help of one of the Homilies that the Article cannot conflict with the Tridentine doctrine of purgatory, which holds that there is a place of purification for those who have already received pardon. When the

[1] Tract No. 90 in *Via Media*, vol. ii. p. 295.

Article speaks of 'pardons' it only means the misuse of indulgences, when these were sold for money on a large scale. In the matter of the cult of images and relics he succeeds in showing the most beautiful agreement between the strong condemnation of the Homilies and the final paragraph of the Tridentine decree about the reverence paid to images: which decree in its chief contents of course is in the sharpest possible conflict with the spirit of the homily quoted.[1] When a mind with Newman's logical acumen uses such a vague likeness in the rejection of certain misuses, in proof of the reconcilability of two standpoints, which are as different as fire and water, posterity may at times doubt if this was done *bona fide*.[2] But it is probably more correct to see in this a proof of how his great passion for the Catholicity of the Church could at times blind even his sharp vision. The invocation of Saints is treated in like manner: not every invocation is rejected in the Homilies, but only sacrifice and prostration, which is casually quoted (in reference to the chosen passages of the Bible). Now the Tridentine decree declares that sacrifice is not offered to saints, but to God alone—and the desired conclusion may be drawn. It is the same with the Mass, which is treated in Article XXXI.[3] Here the plural used in the text of the Article (the sacrifices of Masses) is sufficient to turn topsy-turvy a plain meaning. The sacrifice of the Mass and its doctrine cannot be intended. It only refers to certain

[1] See, *e.g.*, the decree's condemnation of 'affirmantes sanctorum reliquiis venerationem atque honorem non deberi, vel eas aliaque sacra monumenta a fidelibus inutiliter honorari, atque eorum opis impetrandae causa sanctorum memoria frustra frequentari' (Mansi, *Conciliorum Collectio* (Paris, 1902), vol. xxxiii. p. 171). An interesting forerunner and parallel to Tract No. 90 is a treatise by an English convert to Rome of the seventeenth century, Christopher Davenport (as Roman Catholic Sancta Clara). His book, *Deus, Natura, Gratia, sive Tractatus de Praedestinatione, de Meritis, et peccatorum remissione, seu de Justificatione, et denique de Sanctorum Invocatione* (Lyons, 1634), with an appendix *Paraphrastica expositio reliquorum Articulorum confessionis Anglicanae*, also sets out to show that the Articles may be reconciled with Roman doctrine (Storr, *op. cit.* pp. 272–275).

[2] A thorough examination of the context, out of which his *dicta probantia* out of the Homilies and the decrees of Trent are taken, would doubtless put this relation in a stronger light.

[3] 'The sacrifices (*sacrificia*) of Masses, in the which it was commonly said that the Priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, were blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits (*perniciosae imposturae*).'

misuses of special Masses. Further the Article only would exclude the idea that the Mass, independently of the Sacrifice once for all offered on the Cross, is a sacrifice in itself. But to prove this agreement of conception with the decree of Trent is scarcely successful even for Newman's art of quotation. But he is right in so far as that now scarcely anyone would argue that *any* idea of sacrifice is incompatible with the sacramental doctrine of the English Church.

Tract 90 is and remains a very melancholy document. It shows how a really great man can become little in a false and ambiguous position. It is hard not to affirm a certain double-dealing when one compares Newman's later presentation of the matter with the contents of the disputed document. In the former he urges as his standpoint that the Articles must be interpreted in the spirit of the Catholic Church, not in the spirit of the men who chanced to write them. But here everything depends (as was previously stated) on the ominous word Catholic. Actually the tract endeavours to square the doctrine of the Articles not with the standpoint of the primitive Church but with that of Trent. Here already occurs a shadow, which falls ever thicker, over the path of progressive Anglo-Catholicism right down to the present day, the absence of any clear content in the idolised formula of Catholicity. So when one has once left the safe anchorage of static Anglicanism in the common doctrine of the undivided Church, it has been impossible to escape the attraction of Romanism.

One must feel surprise that Newman does not seem to have foreseen at all the storm he was conjuring up.[1] No. 90 roused attention all over England. Within a week it had been quoted in the House of Commons as a proof of the University's disloyalty to the Church of England, and commented on in two temperate articles of the *Times*, which proclaim a high appreciation of what the Oxford Movement had already effected in the uplifting of the Church.[2] In Oxford the flames of controversy soon rose high. The opposing party recognised that something must be done. As their driving force the Tractarians at least regarded C. P. Golightly of Oriel, whom Newman had once selected

[1] Ward, *op. cit.* p. 156. [2] Liddon, vol. ii. p. 165.

for his curate at Littlemore, a pugnacious and wire-pulling Evangelical. But the first visible result of the agitation was a letter to the *Times*, signed by four tutors, foremost among them A. C. Tait,[1] the coming Archbishop. To join the Tractarian writers of history in regarding this as an expression of panic and narrowmindedness [2] will not do. On the contrary it is a temperate, though perhaps in form somewhat clumsy, expression of the very reasonable idea that a method of interpretation like that of the anonymous (but well-known) author of this tract went far beyond the latitude that could be allowed, and made the Articles meaningless as a standard of doctrine. 'The letter of the Four Tutors' concludes with a challenge to the author to give his name.[3] Newman replied only by a polite recognition of the letter 'as expressing the opinion of persons, for whom he entertains much respect and whose names have great weight.' But now the official authorities of the University began to move. The Heads of Houses, who at this time together with the Vice-Chancellor chosen out of their number and the Proctors had the government of the University in their hands, met, and after several debates, on March 16 promulgated their anathema against an interpretation of the Thirty-nine Articles which 'makes subscription to them reconcilable with approval of the errors which they were designed to oppose.' [4] Even before this document was drawn up the controversy had summoned to Newman's side not only the old and tried friends like Keble and Pusey, who professed themselves ready to share the responsibility, but also such as the development of the movement had for a time offended, like W. Palmer and others. So brotherhood in arms cemented the old circle of friends, just before they were to be hopelessly scattered. Newman answered the decree of the rulers of the University by acknowledging his authorship, and declaring

[1] One of the other three, H. B. Wilson, afterwards was famous as one of the authors of *Essays and Reviews*.

[2] Liddon, vol. ii. p. 168. 'The letter of the Four Tutors . . . was an expression of popular prejudice rather than a serious theological criticism' (Church, *op. cit.* p. 253).

[3] The letter is printed in the *Via Media*, vol. ii. p. 359, in Longmans' edition of Newman's works.

[4] The letter, signed by the Vice-Chancellor, is in *Via Media*, vol. ii. p. 362.

that he stood fast by what he had written, though he regretted the disquiet he had produced. He also expresses gratitude for ' a step which, though founded on misconception, may be made as profitable for myself as it is piously and mercifully meant.'[1] His meaning was obviously that it gave him occasion to defend and explain himself. The defence came, within twelve hours of the answer just mentioned, in the shape of ' A Letter addressed to the Rev. R. W. Jelf, D.D., Canon of Christ Church, in explanation of Tract 90.'[2] The recipient of the letter—the literary custom of the day required this form—was chosen as a respected man who had not hitherto taken part in the controversy. The letter maintains that his opponents misunderstood what they attacked. It therefore presses further the difference between the official and the popular Roman, on which Tract 90 had built. After the approved method it quotes a series of Anglican authorities in support of the justification for making this distinction, and also to show how true sons of the Church of England conceded the same latitude which was now once more demanded. But in fact I cannot find that the commentary makes the text more acceptable. In spite of certain reservations, it cannot be denied that Newman attempts to make the Articles compatible with the decrees of Trent. He is so conceived by one of his acutest supporters.[3] After all, Newman shows that both documents agree in denying certain things, and from that draws, or makes the reader draw, the conclusion that they are mutually compatible. But his arbitrarily chosen quotations omit the positive content of both, where the contrast would have been striking. But all the same the letter to Dr. Jelf raises the whole question on to a higher plane, since Newman at the end puts aside the garment of controversy, and makes the true religious passion, which was still the common and productive strength of the movement, burst out with deep and sincere feeling : ' Certainly there is room at present in the religious consciousness of our Church for a development to something deeper than what satisfied last

[1] *Via Media*, vol. ii. p. 363. [2] Reprinted, *ibid.* pp. 365–393.

[3] ' To show that subscription to the Council of Trent is not inconsistent with that to the Thirty-nine Articles, so far as that is shown in the Tract, is plainly no small step towards sympathy between the Churches respectively sanctioning those formularies ' (W. G. Ward in W. Ward, *op. cit.* p. 167).

century.' He calls, as witness to this, in literature, Walter Scott and the Lake School, in Church and theology, Alexander Knox, and noticeably enough even Irving. 'The age is moving towards something, and most unhappily the only religious communion among us, which has of late years been peacefully in possession of this something, is the Church of Rome.' 'She alone, amid all the errors and evils of her practical system, has given free scope to the feelings of awe, mystery, tenderness, reverence, devotedness, and other feelings which may be specially called Catholic. The question then is, whether we shall give them up to the Roman Church, or claim them for ourselves, as we well may, by reverting to that older system, which has of late years indeed been superseded, but which has been and is quite congenial (to say the least), I should rather say, proper and natural, or even necessary to our Church.'

We must read the history of progressive Neo-Anglicanism in the light of this text. In Newman's development its development has, as it were, already taken shape, though the elasticity of the society in his case seemed insufficient, while it has later grown to such an extent that now it seems scarcely to know any limits.

It was bound to be a far more serious trial for Newman, when his ecclesiastical superior took action in the matter of Tract 90. Bishop Bagot of Oxford, not without pressure from Canterbury, felt compelled to intervene. He declared his disapproval of the Tract, and a discussion followed, in which Pusey acted as messenger between Oriel and Cuddesdon. The end was that Newman agreed, not to suppress the edition of the disputed document, but to discontinue the series at his Bishop's command, and also in an open letter to express his loyalty to the Church of England. The letter to the Bishop[1] (March 30) was, though covering twenty-eight pages, written in a single day, and shows perhaps some traces of hurry in composition. In any case the defence which is made in it for some of the other disputed tracts, and particularly the last, is not specially noteworthy. But three

[1] *A Letter addressed to the Right Rev. Father in God, Richard, Lord Bishop of Oxford, on Occasion of the Ninetieth Tract*, reprinted in *Via Media*, vol. ii. pp. 395–424.

things appear with great clearness ; that the author is burning with sympathy for the devout individuals in the Church of Rome, though he quotes his own earlier attacks on its system —that his loyalty to the Church of England is still whole-hearted, and that, as also appears from ' Apologia,'[1] he has now taken his stand on one single note of the true Church, and seeks safety therein, the note of holiness. Here he is led for a moment up to a spiritual height which has too seldom been reached in the history of Neo-Anglicanism or Newman's own : ' It is sanctity of heart and conduct which commends us to God. If we be holy, all will go well with us. External things are comparatively nothing ; whatever be a religious body's relation to the State—whatever its regimen—whatever its doctrines—whatever its worship—if it has but the life of holiness within it, this inward gift will, if I may so speak, take care of itself. It will turn all accidents into good, it will supply defects, and it will gain for itself from above what is wanting. I desire to look at this first, in all persons, and all communities. When Almighty God stirs the heart, then His other gifts follow in time ; sanctity is the great Note of His Church. If the Established Church of Scotland has this Note, I will hope all good things of it ; if the Roman Church in Ireland has it not, I can hope no good of it. And in like manner, in our own Church, I will unite with all persons as brethren, who have this Note, without any distinction of party.'

It is not the old Newman who speaks here. The tragic process which now went on in his soul was perhaps in its depth what we have already called the growth of his religious genius. Still its goal might perhaps have been different. New events forced on the result.

The controversy about Tract 90 died away after Newman's letter to the Bishop. The shower of pamphlets[2] which followed was the spray after the wave had been broken against the cliff. Of great importance was the fact that the blow which seemed to strike the whole Tractarian Movement, when the series closed with Tract 90, collected to Newman's side even Churchmen of markedly static type like Hook and Palmer. Palmer even took up his pen to defend it against

[1] P. 150 (ed. 1908).

[2] Liddon, *op. cit.* vol. ii. p. 289.

Wiseman. Keble also came in, but without publishing his contribution. Pusey's defence is perhaps more important. It took the form of a dissertation, addressed to Dr. Jelf, who for the second time became the object of such attention merely because of his impartiality.[1] Pusey identified his position entirely with that of Newman, and almost twenty-five years later gave his approval on the whole to Tract 90: it had freed the Articles from the glosses which, in the course of time, had stuck to them.[2]

Everyone knows how Newman described the years after 1841 as his Anglican death-bed.[3] We have here less to follow the gradual course of the disease, in so far as it was an inner development of the soul, than to give a conspectus of external circumstances, which hastened both their inward development and the external crisis of the movement. The least serious was a defeat in a matter of academic preferment, which the peculiar state of English University life made a trial of strength between two parties. It arose over the Chair of Poetry vacant by Keble's retirement. Among the candidates was Isaac Williams, Keble's pupil, author of 'The Cathedral,' a long didactic poem, a poetic counterpart of imitative Gothic architecture of the time, but certainly in a higher degree than that the expression of a genuine and warm feeling.[4] A series of poems in 'Lyra Apostolica' were also by him, also various contributions to the *British Magazine*.[5] 'The Baptistery,' published anonymously in 1842, must be his most considerable work. By his poetic production he was on the whole better qualified for the post than his competitors. But his name was hitherto chiefly known for the unlucky tracts 'On Reserve.' So the opposite party mustered their troops, the confidence and number of which began to grow through Arnold's influence.

[1] *The Articles treated of in Tract 90 reconsidered and their Interpretation vindicated in a Letter to the Rev. R. W. Jelf, D.D., Canon of Christ Church* (Oxford, 1841).

[2] In 1865 he issued a new edition of Tract No. 90, with an historical preface (see this, p. xxxv, and Liddon, *op. cit.* vol. ii. p. 164).

[3] *Apologia*, p. 257 (ed. 1908, p. 147).

[4] Cp. W. H. Hutton in *The Cambridge History of English Literature* (Cambridge, 1915), vol. xii. p. 266.

[5] We may specially mention his translation of hymns from the Paris Breviary, which later gave occasion to J. Chandler to introduce more fully to the English Church the best hymns.

When the decision came, on January 1, 1842, Williams suffered a crushing defeat,[1] and this was also a measure of the position of the Tractarian party in public opinion (Newman had himself desired that Williams should not stand).

More far-reaching was the question of an Anglo-Prussian Bishopric in Jerusalem. It was a strange combination which made Niebuhr's pupil, the learned archaeologist and theologian, the eirenic Churchman, C. C. J. Bunsen [2] (after 1857 Freiherr von Bunsen), one of the factors which were to force Newman out of the Church of England ; strange also that such a true-born offspring of romanticism as the Anglo-Prussian Bishopric in Jerusalem should become a touchstone of the Oxford Movement, which has often been regarded as essentially a product of romanticism. Bunsen, who had become familiar with England earlier through his marriage and by visits, was sent by Frederick William IV in the spring of 1841 to realise the King's favourite dream, a bishopric in Jerusalem, founded with the co-operation of Prussia and England. It was to aim at giving Protestants a recognised status in the Holy Land : it was also to be united with the hospital of the English mission to the Jews in Jerusalem. The Bishop was to get his orders from the English Church, but subscribe to the Augsburg confession and observe the order of the German Evangelical Church. For the missionary cause it was important that the Protestant Churches in the Holy Land should form a united body. The King could hardly have found a more devoted servant to carry out this plan than Bunsen. It was as it were a child of his own heart. He found it easy to secure support in England. Archbishop Howley and Blomfield, Bishop of London, took up the proposal, possibly with the secret hope of thus ingrafting episcopacy on the whole Prussian Church. Though one may suppose that such thoughts were not foreign to Frederick William IV, Bunsen's widow, who wrote his life, rejects the

[1] The actual division did not take place : a preliminary vote showed how the land lay, and Williams retired.

[2] Bunsen's life, which also casts interesting light upon the literary, political, theological, and ecclesiastical aims of the nineteenth century, has been written by his (English) widow in *A Memoir of Baron Bunsen* (London, 1868) ; also in German by P. Nippold, *Christian Carl Josias Freiherr von Bunsen aus seinen Briefen und nach eigener Erinnerung geschildert von seiner Witwe* (Leipzig, 1868).

suspicion that anything of the sort was behind this scheme as quite unfounded.[1] The Evangelical leaders, particularly Lord Ashley, greeted the idea with rapture. In the Government of the day (Melbourne's) the proposal was well received. We may suppose it fitted well Lord Palmerston's active policy in the East, in which earlier he got support from Prussia. But it was, however, only after the second ministry of Peel came into office that the approval of Parliament was obtained on October 5, 1841. Half of the sum required for the erection of the bishopric was to be paid by Prussia : the other half was realised by subscription in England. A Bishop was to be appointed alternately by the English and Prussian Governments, but in any case was to have Anglican ordination. On November 7, Dr. M. Alexander, 'a Jew by extraction, a Prussian by birth, an Anglican by confession—come to maturity in Ireland,'[2] previously Professor of Hebrew at King's College, London, was consecrated 'Bishop of the Church of St. James in Jerusalem.' At the festivities following the solemnity speech and song gave expression to the friendship between England and Prussia, which in the light of later events has a grotesque effect.

The antithesis between the well-meant eirenic liberalism which set on foot this undertaking, which, as the later developments showed, was quite unpractical, and the dawning Neo-Anglicanism, whose violent condemnation can only be understood if one remembers that they saw deeply religious values menaced—this antithesis puts in a clear light the tragedy of the course of Church history that we are following. But the Oxford front was not unbroken. Pusey, who through his brother had come into personal contact with Bunsen, regarded the plan of providing a congregation in Jerusalem, which did not understand the language of the Orthodox Church, with a Bishop of its own, as defensible, and seems to have cherished hopes that the Prussian Church might be gradually Catholicised through the connections thus formed.[3] He was only partially overruled by his more irreconcilable friends. Among these were not only so conservative a Churchman as A. P. Perceval, but the radically Catholic

[1] *A Memoir of Baron Bunsen*, vol. ii. p. 166.
[2] *Ibid.* vol. ii. p. 171. [3] Liddon, *op. cit.* vol. ii. p. 250.

phalanx with Ward and W. Palmer of Magdalen (to be distinguished from his namesake of Worcester). To them the new bishopric implied partly an intrusion into the Orthodox Patriarchate of Jerusalem, partly an infection by co-operation with the heretical Church of Prussia—whether they regarded every form of Protestantism as equally dangerous, or the united Prussian Church as an eclectic State religion worse than pure Lutheranism. No one objected as violently as Newman. His letters in the decisive weeks show him in complete mental agitation. The Archbishop, he says, is doing his best 'to unchurch us'[1]; and in a letter to Bowden, when the matter was already settled, of December 21, 1841, we read: 'If the Prussian plan is carried out, it will cut my ground clean from under me. For eight years I have been writing, either to *prove*, or on the ground that we *are* a branch of the Catholic Church, that we were committed to nothing inconsistent with it.' So he felt himself compelled to come forward with a public protest. This, which he delivered to his own Bishop, is drawn up in the solemn style of legal English, in a series of sentences beginning with 'whereas,' and affirms that heresy is destructive of the catholicity of a Church, that 'Lutheranism and Calvinism are heresies, repugnant to Scripture, springing up three centuries since, and anathematised by East as well as West,' and since the erection of the new bishopric implies a certain sanction of these heresies, therefore—'I in my place, being a Priest of the English Church, and Vicar of St. Mary's, Oxford, by way of relieving my conscience, do hereby solemnly protest against the measure aforesaid, and disown it as removing our Church from her present ground and tending to her disorganisation.'[2]

One cannot help seeing that Newman has departed far from the freer standpoint which for a moment flashes out in the letter to the Bishop about Tract 90. But the energy of the protest is explained by his feeling that the official acts of his Church refuted his own theory of it and thus drove him to the goal from

[1] *Letters*, vol. ii. p. 352 (ed. 1903, p. 315); cp. *Apologia*, pp. 245–253, 260 (ed. 1908, pp. 141–146, 149): 'The Jerusalem Bishopric was the ultimate condemnation of the old theory of the *Via Media* . . . it demolished the sacredness of diocesan rights. If England could be in Palestine, Rome might be in England.'

[2] *Ibid.* vol. ii. pp. 362 f. (ed. 1903, p. 324).

which he still shrank. Other events about the same time contributed: the Bishop of Winchester refused to ordain a curate to Keble on the ground of his too 'catholic' view of the Eucharist,[1] the Bishop of London also refused a candidate on similar grounds.[2]

Like the Church, the University too, still essentially a member of the Church, seemed by its action to prove the unworkableness of *Via Media*. Hampden's attempt to use his authority in the granting of theological degrees to attack High Anglican doctrine [3] was of less consequence than the vehement assault directed against Pusey himself. On May 14, 1843, Pusey delivered in Christ Church a sermon on 'The Holy Eucharist a Comfort to the Penitent.' This is after a fashion a counterpart to his earlier treatment of Baptism in the Tracts. According to his own account he wanted to help those who could not rest for thinking of the sins they had committed after baptism. The sermon was very lengthy through quotations from the Fathers, especially Cyril of Alexandria, and chiefly on that account contained expressions which contrasted vividly with the language about the Eucharist people were accustomed to hear from Anglican pulpits ; [4] but in the main he adhered to the point of view previously (*e.g.* by A. Knox) emphasised as Anglican, that he would not explain the nature of the presence of Christ's Body and Blood, but bowed before it as an unapproachable mystery. Pusey's sermon is in more than one respect the starting-point of the development of the Neo-Anglican doctrine of the Eucharist. Thus we find in it the oft-recurring thought of the Eucharist as a 'commemorating Sacrifice,' in so far as 'He (the Saviour) in it puts us in a position to plead before the Father the one meritorious offering

[1] *Letters*, vol. ii. pp. 350, 374, 379 (ed. 1903, pp. 314, 334, 339) : 'It is not love of Rome that unsettles people, but fear of heresy at home.'

[2] *Apologia*, p. 270 (ed. 1908, p. 159). A collection of contemporary utterances in pastorals, etc., directly bearing on the Oxford Movement was published in 1845 by W. S. Bricknell, *The Judgment of the Bishops upon Tractarian Theology*. Pusey's *Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury on some Circumstances connected with the Present Crisis in the English Church* of 1842 is chiefly designed to show how the attitude of the episcopate, revealed in the matter of the 'Jerusalem Bishopric' and in various pastorals, threatened to drive out of the Church some of her most devoted sons.

[3] In the Macmullen case (Church, *op. cit.* p. 273).

[4] Amongst those which caused offence were expressions, *e.g.*, 'that Bread which is His flesh,' 'touching with our very lips that cleansing Blood.

upon the Cross, which He, our High-Priest, ceaselessly in His Own Divine Person pleads in Heaven.'[1] It is unnecessary to describe the strange proceedings that followed in a heresy suit, when Dr. Faussett, Margaret Professor of Theology, delated Pusey's sermon to the Vice-Chancellor to be examined according to the University Statutes, how the Tribunal of the six doctors (among the six were the accuser himself, Hawkins, Provost of Oriel, and Jelf, who probably voted for acquittal), without having allowed the accused to defend himself in person, but after having privately required of him certain explanations, which he did not feel able to give, passed judgment on the sermon in MS. before them (January 2, 1843) that Pusey was guilty of ' quaedam doctrinae Ecclesiae Anglicanae dissona et contraria protulisse,' wherefore he was forbidden for two years to preach ' intra praecinctum Universitatis.'

It was of no use that Pusey protested, or that important expressions of sympathy came to him partly even from persons who could not be counted among his direct supporters,[2] and from such sponsors of static High Anglicanism as Hook and Churton[3]; he did not succeed in getting any revision of the sentence, whether before civil or spiritual authority, and the suspension for two years became to all England a sign that the chief teaching body in the Church condemned his doctrine.

Pusey's own loyalty to his Church could scarcely have been put to a harder test. He stood it, and when he once more mounted the pulpit, no one ventured to renew the attack. His personal authority was rather strengthened by a persecution which, even to an impartial judgment, must appear petty and unjust. But there was truth in what Newman said, that the affair would ' tend to alienate still more from the Church persons of whose attachment to it there is already cause to be suspicious. It is one of those events which tend to bring matters to a crisis.'[4] The words are especially true of Newman himself.

[1] Liddon, *op. cit.* vol. ii. p. 308.

[2] Among the signatories of the protest against the proceedings in Pusey's case we notice W. E. Gladstone and J. T. Coleridge. The Vice-Chancellor refused to receive it.

[3] Liddon, *op. cit.* vol. ii. p. 349. At the same time Hook made it clear that it was impossible for him to ' go to the length of Oakeley, Ward, etc.'

[4] *Letters*, vol. ii. p. 414 (ed. 1903, p. 371).

It is instructive to see how the impressions of the events of this year are reflected in Newman's lectures on the 'Difficulties of Anglicans,' delivered after his secession. Here in the fiery language of the agitator he shows how the 'Establishment' spat out of its mouth the Catholic principles which the Oxford Movement lived on and worked to propagate, how it lost all real footing inside the National Church, nay became entirely hostile to its nature.[1]

Since February 1842 he had turned his back on Oxford and settled at Littlemore, a small village two miles out of Oxford, and part of the parish of St. Mary-the-Virgin. Here in 1835 he had built a chapel, and five years later he began to erect what in a letter to a friend he calls a μονή,[2] a little group consisting of a library, a small chapel, some 'cells,' all surrounded by a plantation. The arrangement involuntarily suggests the idea of a monastery on a small scale. One is probably scarcely wrong, if one associates it with the growing sympathy for 'vita religiosa,' which occurs just now in other men of the movement, especially Pusey. In 1840 Pusey was also thinking of instituting Anglican 'Sisters of Mercy,' but Newman is sceptical with regard to this plan.[3]

[1] See, *e.g.*, *Difficulties of Anglicans*, vol. i. p. 20: 'Now Protestantism is as it has been for centuries, the Religion of England, and since the semi-patristical Church, which was set up for the nation at the Reformation, is the organ of that Religion, it must live for the nation, it must hide its Catholic aspirations in folios, or in college cloisters; it must call itself Protestant when it gets into the pulpit . . . *la Reine le veut*. The English people is sufficient for itself; it wills to be Protestant and progressive; and Fathers, Councils, Schoolmen, Scriptures, Saints, Angels, and what is above them must give way. What are they to it?' *Ibid.* pp. 152 f.: 'My brethren, when it was at length plain that primitive Christianity ignored the National Church, and that the National Church cared little for primitive Christianity, or for those who appealed to it as her foundation, when Bishops spoke against them, and Bishops' Courts sentenced them, and Universities degraded them, and the people were against them, from that day their occupation was gone. . . . They had but a choice between doing nothing at all, and looking out for truth and peace elsewhere.' History has not justified Newman. A third possibility was already potentially in view, and the succeeding generations have made it a reality. With the above quotations must be compared a document of the actual crisis, a note to a sermon on 'Outward and Inward Notes of the Church,' in *Sermons on Subjects of the Day*, p. 340. To this Newman points as to a description of his own case in a letter to Pusey of February 19, 1844 (Liddon, *op. cit.* vol. ii. p. 381).

[2] *Letters*, vol. ii. p. 304 (ed. 1903, p. 272).

[3] *Ibid.* vol. ii. p. 293 (ed. 1903, p. 267). Pusey visited Ireland as early as 1841 to study the *modus operandi* of the R.C. female orders.

One cannot wonder that the settlement at Littlemore—of which nothing is left now but a little row of houses along the dusty village street—excited much attention, though one could wish it had taken less importunate forms than those which Newman indignantly describes[1]: 'One day, when I entered my house, I found a flight of Undergraduates inside. Heads of Houses, as mounted patrols, walked their horses round those poor cottages. Doctors of Divinity dived into the hidden recesses of that private tenement uninvited, and drew domestic conclusions from what they saw there. I had thought that an Englishman's house was his castle; but the newspapers thought otherwise, and at last the matter came before my good Bishop.' Bishop Bagot found himself obliged to require an explanation concerning 'the Anglo-Catholic Monastery at Littlemore.' It is difficult not to feel that Newman's explanation[2] is a little forced. He makes out that the whole affair is really a 'parsonage-house' for Littlemore, where he hoped to find a refuge 'under the prevailing excitement,' and to be able to devote himself to study, the concerns of his own parish, and devotional exercises. He denies any monastic character, but this can scarcely be reconciled with the expressions he used about the institution in letters to intimate friends.[3]

The fact was that a number of young men, clergymen and undergraduates, were received here, and that they lived a quite regular 'religious' life. For some Littlemore was a resting-place on the road to Rome—one has no occasion to doubt Newman's assurance that he succeeded in stopping several secessions[4]; for others it was the beginning of a liberation from Newman's magic spell; thus, *e.g.*, for Mark Pattison, who in his 'Memoirs' gives an extract from the diary of his life at Littlemore, showing the over-heated atmosphere of the place—at least it looks

[1] *Apologia*, p. 289 (ed. 1908, p. 172).

[2] *Ibid.* p. 290 (ed. 1908, p. 173); *Letters*, vol. ii. p. 291 (ed. 1908, p. 350).

[3] In a letter of 1840 to Pusey the question of 'a monastic house' is connected with the plan now being discussed of providing for the needs of big towns by Colleges of unmarried clergy. Littlemore was to be a training school for something of the sort. The letter is in Liddon, *op. cit.* vol. ii. p. 135 (not in *Letters*); cp. also *Letters*, vol. ii. p. 303.

[4] *Apologia*, p. 295 (ed. 1908, p. 177).

so, seen through the medium of the later frigidly Liberal Anglicanism of Pattison.[1]

Of the Littlemore period there survive two literary monuments: first a number of sermons, delivered by Newman at St. Mary's (where he was now an infrequent visitor) and Littlemore, collected in the volume, 'Sermons on Subjects of the Day,' where some of the most precious jewels of Newman's eloquence are to be found; secondly, the series of 'Lives of the British Saints,' planned at Littlemore. Behind both lies the thought, in which Newman sought a last line of defence in his retreat from the *Via Media*, the idea of 'the note of sanctity' as sufficient to justify a Church's existence—the idea which we have seen flash out in some of the most deep and intimate lines that ever flowed from his pen.

'Sermons on Subjects of the Day,' the preface to which is dated Littlemore, Nov. 25, 1843, are, according to the author, to be regarded rather as a collection of essays than as sermons in the proper sense, in that the printed edition contains certain passages which were never delivered from the pulpit, partly because loyalty to the Church he still served prevented it.[2] This does not lessen their importance as a document for the crisis of *Via Media* and of Newman's own life. Of the twenty-six sermons in the volume, five belong to the thirties, two to 1840, five to 1841, nine to 1842, and five to 1843. Some of the earlier sermons and a few of the later are more important as illustrating the nature of Tractarian piety than as biographical documents. But those of 1841, the year of Tract 90, excellently illustrate the change in attitude of the Anglican conception of the Church, forced on by events: 'Alas! I cannot deny that the outward notes of the Church are partly gone from us and partly going'—a note informs us that this alludes to the Bishopric at Jerusalem— . . . 'The Church of God is under eclipse among us. Where is our unity, for which Christ prayed? Where our charity, which He enjoined? Where the faith once delivered, when each has his own doctrine? Where our visibility, which was to be a light to the

[1] Pattison, *Memoirs*, pp. 189–207. Pattison had been brought up as an Evangelical, and was attracted by the purely religious force of Tractarianism (*ibid.* pp. 172, 208).

[2] See on the point Note C, 'Sermon on Wisdom and Innocence' in *Apologia*, especially p. 312 in Longmans' edition.

world?'[1] And yet the inner notes cannot be denied. Such are the blessings brought to the individual by the order and activity of the Church, consolation in Divine service, in preaching, in the sacred seasons of the Church's year, in the soul's experience of the Sacrament of the Altar,[2] but especially the witness of the hallowed life lived within the Church of England: 'Surely that is a Church visited by the influences of Divine Grace, which contains in her pale men so saintly in their lives, so heavenly in their hearts and minds, so self-denying, so obedient, as are vouchsafed to her even in this degenerate time. Is it not safe to trust our souls in their company? Is it not dangerous to part company with them in our journey across the trackless wilderness?'[3] 'Apologia' gives us a kind of intimate commentary on these sermons: 'We were not nothing: we could not be as if we never had been a Church; we were Samaria.'[4] This idea is not expressed in all its harshness in 'Sermons on Subjects of the Day,' but it throws a strong light on the sermons that dated from 1842 onwards, which with an emphasis scarcely otherwise comprehensible dwell on the connection and correspondence between the Jewish and Christian Churches,—Newman loves in his sermons to clothe his ideas in the pomp of Old Testament imagery. In the second sermon in the collection, 'Saintliness not forfeited by the Penitent' (Oct. 16, 1842), the ideal of perfect sanctity shines out with brighter radiance than elsewhere. Next to personal holiness, the demand that the heart be made the Temple of the Holy Ghost, and a Church on a small scale, is the thought of the condition of the Church without. Its peace cannot return, unless peace and concord rule in the hearts of all Christian believers. The two stand in hidden correspondence with each other: 'We cannot hope for peace at home while we are at war abroad; we cannot hope for the recovery of dissenting bodies, while we are ourselves alienated from the great body of Christendom. . . . Surely we have abundant evidence on all sides of us, that the division of Churches is the corruption of hearts.'[5] Personal salvation

[1] *Sermons on Subjects of the Day*, p. 335.
[2] *Ibid.* p. 321; cp. p. 338.
[3] *Ibid.* pp. 355 f.
[4] *Apologia*, p. 264 (ed. 1908, p. 152).
[5] *Sermons on Subjects of the Day*, p. 132.

is the most pressing concern. 'Let this be first; and secondly, labour for the unity of the Church; let the peace of Jerusalem and the edification of the Body of Christ be an object of prayer, close upon that of your own personal salvation.' But elsewhere the Church is sketched by expressions which too plainly show the image of Rome in the background: it is an 'Imperial Power';[1] 'it has external things in common with the worldly empires, but its edifying force is holiness in the place of injustice.'[2]

Now the thought strikes him that, as once *catenae patrum* served to vindicate the apostolicity of the Tractarian doctrines, and to summon the teachers of the Church to their support, so now he will by a *catena sanctorum* show that *the note of sanctity* has never been entirely wanting in the Church through the ages. The plan of the series of 'Lives of English Saints' took definite form in the summer of 1842.[3] But those who were to be chiefly influenced by the scheme were men who were already on the road to Rome. It was to 'bring them from doctrine to history, from speculation to fact,' to give them 'an interest in the English soil and the English Church, and to keep them from seeking sympathy in Rome, as she is.' But it is significant that the promoter of the series did not venture to extend his plan so as to embrace the modern Church. His 'Calendar of English Saints'[4] contains no name later than the fifteenth century. He also soon saw that 'some portions of the series would be written in a style inconsistent with the professions of a beneficed clergyman,'[5] and it began to come out just after he had given up his living. But after the first two parts he resigned the editorship, and for the biographies that appeared later the writers were themselves responsible.

[1] Sermon XVI (November 27, 1842).

[2] Sermon XVIII, 'Sanctity the Token of the Christian Empire' (December 4, 1842).

[3] *Apologia*, p. 337 (ed. 1908, p. 210). The idea can be traced back to 1841. In notes on his letters Newman has shown how Wiseman's article on the Donatists drove him to emphasise the idea of the English Church as a unity in itself in the Middle Ages, and how this gave rise to the *Lives of English Saints*.

[4] Printed in *Apologia* (in the later editions: the original edition has instead a reply to Kingsley's attack on the series) as Note D (together with Newman's advertisement of the series, dated September 9, 1843). The list includes missionaries of English origin, thus Sigfrid, Eskil, and David in Sweden.

[5] *Apologia*, p. 339 (ed. 1908, p. 211).

The object which Newman had in view was hardly attained by the series. Some of the writers continued their way to Rome, others were and remained Anglicans: in the case of others, dealing with hagiographic material led to thorough scepticism all round. Hurrell Froude's younger and better-known brother, James Anthony, who during his early Oxford years could not escape Newman's influence, wrote a life of a little known saint in the time of Alfred the Great, and ended it with the words: 'This is all, and perhaps more than all, that is known of his life.'[1]

When one of the young men who belonged to the little brotherhood at Littlemore, William Lockhart, was received into the Roman Church[2]—he was the first of the Oxford School to take this step—Newman found his position untenable for external as well as internal reasons. In Feb. 1843 he had already published a formal retractation of the hard words he had previously used in the controversy with Rome: he had uttered them not as his own in the proper sense, but as expressing the consensus of Anglican theologians.[3] His real feeling is plainly expresssed in the correspondence of the year. In May he writes: 'I consider the Roman Catholic Communion to be the Church of the Apostles, and that what grace is among us (which, through God's mercy, is not little) is extraordinary, and from the overflowings of His dispensation:'[4] on Sept. 29 of the same year he writes to his sister: 'I do so despair of the Church of England, and am so evidently cast off by her, and, on the other hand, I am so drawn to the Church of Rome, that I think it *safer* as a matter of honesty *not* to keep my living.'[5]

[1] G. P. Gooch, *History and Historians in the Nineteenth Century* (2nd ed., London, 1913), p. 332. In 1849 came out Froude's *Nemesis of Faith*, where he partly describes his own development, but makes his hero more fully imbibe the narcotic influence of Rome.

[2] Newman informs his Bishop of this on August 29, 1843 (*Apologia*, p. 341; ed. 1908, p. 213). For Lockhart's secession see also *Letters*, vol. i. pp. 417, 422 (ed. 1903, pp. 374, 378).

[3] This retractation (*Apologia*, p. 323; ed. 1908, p. 200) was rather an apology for violence of language than a formal renunciation of the Anglican position. Newman also found it necessary, on his entry into the Roman Church, to publish a fresh 'Retractation of Anti-Catholic Statements' (*Via Media*, vol. ii. pp. 427–433).

[4] *Apologia*, p. 355 (ed. 1908, p. 208).

[5] *Letters*, vol. ii. p. 425 (ed. 1903, p. 380).

Then the decisive steps had already been taken. On the 18th and 19th September he took the legal steps to resign his position as Vicar of St. Mary's. On the 24th his voice was heard for the last time from his old pulpit in the University Church. On the 25th, the anniversary of the consecration of Littlemore Church, he delivered the touching sermon on 'The Parting of Friends,' which was his Anglican swan-song. Scarcely anywhere else does he show as here, how deeply he felt the tragic crisis of his life. Formally he is dealing with imagery from the language of prophecy about Jerusalem, but one need not doubt as to the object of his thoughts, when he exclaims: 'O my mother, whence is this unto thee, that thou hast good things poured upon thee and canst not keep them, and bearest children, yet darest not own them? Why hast thou not the skill to use their services, nor the heart to rejoice in their love? how is it that, whatever is generous in purpose and tender, or deep in devotion, thy flower and thy promise, falls from thy bosom and finds no home within thy arms? Who hath put this note upon thee, to have "a miscarrying womb and dry breasts"; to be strange to thine own flesh, and thine eye cruel towards thy little ones? Thine own offspring, the fruit of thy womb, who love thee and would toil for thee, thou dost gaze upon with fear, as though a portent, or thou dost loathe as an offence; at best thou dost but endure, as if they had no claim but on thy patience, self-possession, and vigilance, to be rid of them as easily as thou mayest. Thou makest them "stand all the day idle," as the very condition of thy bearing with them; or thou biddest them be gone, where they will be more welcome; or thou sellest them for nought to the stranger that passes by.'[1] Once more at St. Mary's altar he gave communion to a party of friends (Oct. 14).[2] Afterwards he regarded himself as no longer a priest in the service of the Church of England, but continued in lay communion with her during the two years he lived on as a hermit in his little 'Monastery' at Littlemore (it was his private property).

The account of these years, in which perhaps he has already

[1] *Sermons on Subjects of the Day*, p. 407. The impression of one who heard the sermon in E. Bellasis, *Memorials of Mr. Serjeant Bellasis*, 1800–1873 (London, 1893), p. 52.

[2] Liddon, *Life of Pusey*, vol. ii. p. 376.

leapt over the chasm, but is waiting for divine guidance to take the external step, and his thought is busily forging the dialectical foundations of the new position to the same strength which he once thought he could give to *Via Media*—this account scarcely belongs to the history of Anglicanism. The abiding pain of parting, consideration for friends and relations, and on the other hand the feeling of being guided by an invisible hand to a land now near and perceptible—all this can be read in the letters of this year, touching documents for the history of a solitary soul, but hardly for that of a single Church. The echoes of events in neighbouring Oxford chime in, but feebly, already as if from another world, even when it is his own name which is the object of controversy. Thus we come to 1845, occupied by the task of giving shape to the idea of development, which took the place of the static conception of the Church in ' Via Media,' the idea which is now to give the theoretic ground for the acceptance of the Catholic system. What once were distortions and excrescences, the cult of saints, Mariolatry, and the rest, are now seen only as a materialised magnification of the peculiarities of the Apostolic Church.[1] An analysis of the idea of development with Newman—a development which is rather to be compared ' to the unrolling of a scroll than the growth of a tree,' [2] but which yet seems to anticipate a thought to be given a wider application in a later generation—the tests which are given of an identity that remains during the process of development—all this does not belong to the question which is our present subject.[3] Newman's ' Essay on the Development of Doctrine ' belongs rather to his Roman than to his Anglican history, though it was broken off without proper conclusion when the formal decision was taken. The somewhat obscure lines, which lead from it to the productive ideas of Roman Catholic Modernism, can neither be drawn out nor discussed in this connection.[4]

[1] ' The whole scene of pale, faint, distant Apostolic Christianity is seen in Rome as through a telescope or magnifier ' (*Apologia*, p. 320 ; ed. 1908, p. 196).

[2] Inge, *Outspoken Essays*, p. 198.

[3] See Söderblom, *Religions Problemet*, pp. 51 f. ; Storr, *Development of English Theology*, pp. 311–316.

[4] For this problem we may refer to the chapter ' Cardinal Newman and Modernism ' in Sarolea, *Cardinal Newman* ; the relevant chapter in Söderblom, *op. cit.* ; Inge's Essays on ' Newman ' and ' Modernism ' in *Outspoken Essays* ; and the literature on Modernism generally.

In the beginning of October he resigned his fellowship of Oriel.[1] It has been pointed out that Newman was received into the Church of Rome the same day (Oct. 9, 1845) on which Renan abandoned finally his clerical dress.[2]

It remains now to take a glance at the course of events in Oxford during these years. The old Tractarian brotherhood seems to have been broken up. Keble had long since ceased to frequent the University city, Newman had retired to Littlemore, Pusey alone was left, but as a marked man, debarred from the University pulpits by the judgment of the six doctors. His sensitive nature suffered thereby, and the thought of Newman's dangerous development was a constant source of disquiet. Family trouble was also added to his burden.[3] All this combined to bring about in him a firmer concentration than ever on the inner life. He now conceived the plan of giving new food to the religious life of the Church of England by the editing of Catholic books of devotion. With the application of terms we have already coined, one might say, that this shows how the progressive element in Neo-Anglicanism gets the upper hand in him, at the same time how its driving force is the peculiar energy of the devotional life, and how easily this works or may seem to work in the direction of Rome.

To Pusey the English Church was Catholic, and she had full right to all that was really Catholic in Roman literature of edification. To introduce this to the Church of England would contribute to Catholicise her life of devotion, just as the 'Library of the Fathers' had contributed to Catholicise her theology.[4] It was also possible in this case to point to an example of Caroline times, when Laud published a treatise of St. François de Sales, and others had translated Fénelon and Bellarmine—nay even Wesley had published treatises by Juan d'Avila, Molinos, etc.[5] As it is with Pusey that the influx of Catholic devotional literature into the English Church

[1] *Letters*, vol. ii. p. 467 (1903, p. 418).

[2] W. Barry, *Newman* (3rd ed., London, 1905), p. 83.

[3] His best beloved daughter, Lucy, died April 22, 1844, before she could realise her intention of formally devoting her life to God's service (Liddon, *op. cit.* vol. ii. pp. 383–388).

[4] Newman dissuades such a course in 1843; he saw clearly that it could only pave the way to Rome.

[5] Liddon, *op. cit.* vol. ii. p. 388.

seriously begins, it is interesting to notice how from the first the French seventeenth century literature takes the leading place. Pusey first occupies himself with translating two works by Avrillon,[1] which came out in 1844, 'A Guide for Passing Advent Holily,' and 'A Guide for Passing Lent Holily.' These were followed by 'The Foundations of the Spiritual Life, drawn from the book of the Imitation of Jesus Christ,' also from the French.[2] However, he never carried out his long-cherished scheme of putting out an English Breviary. Even Avrillon (though bearing a dedication to 'Our Mother, in whom we were born anew to God, and in whose bosom we hope to die, the Church of England') caused disquietude in the camp of static Anglicanism. Others enquired: if one must get books of devotion from the Church of Rome, is not that a sign of a richer spiritual life in her?[3]

While Newman's decision slowly ripened and Pusey, with unshakable fidelity to his Church, brought in an element which was to prove not easily digestible, the extreme group, which once pushed Newman forward, were driven out by a dramatic catastrophe. We have already been introduced to W. G. Ward. The untenableness of his position in the English Church had more and more become apparent. There is no occasion to analyse further the psychological factors which made it possible for Ward, during the years 1841–3, in a series of articles in the *British Critic*, to attack his own Church often in the most violent language, at the same time exalting Rome, and yet to remain as the servant of the English Church. His choice of language must have amazed not only Protestants: 'Should the pure light of the Gospel be ever restored to this benighted land'[4]

[1] Jean-Baptiste-Élie Avrillon (1652–1729), of the Order of St. Francis de Paul, won great attention as a religious author. Among his works are the three treatises *Conduite pour passer le saint temps de l'Avent; Pour passer saintement le temps de Carême; Les fêtes et Octave de la Pentecôte* (*Nouvelle Biographie Universelle*, s.v. Avrillon). In 1845 Pusey published another translation from the same author, *The Year of Affections*.

[2] Jean-Joseph Surin (properly Seurin; 1600–65), well known as an ascetic writer (the original of the work adapted, *Fondements de la vie Spirituelle*, which was published posthumously in 1669, must be his most popular work) and also for the sickly demonomania by which he was possessed for a long period of his life (*Nouvelle Biographie Universelle*, s.v. Surin).

[3] Thus Copeland. For Pusey's answers to these doubts see Liddon, *op. cit.* vol. ii. p. 395.

[4] Quoted from Church, p. 311.

is a quotation of 1841. He can talk of the Pope as 'the earthly representative of the Church's Divine Head,' and of Rome as 'Our Mother in the Faith.' Ward's articles caused the cessation of the *British Critic* in 1843 (whereupon an organ of the more conservative wing took its place, *The Christian Remembrancer*), and they were the occasion of W. Palmer publishing his *Narrative*.[1]

Robbed of his previous platform, Ward began to develop his standpoint in a book which was also to be an answer to Palmer's contribution. In June 1844 appeared 'The Ideal of a Christian Church considered in comparison with Existing Practice: Containing a Defence of certain Articles in the *British Critic* in Reply to Remarks on them in Mr. Palmer's Narrative.' This voluminous and in parts ill-compiled volume has a greater interest than is given it by its place in Anglo-Roman polemic history. It forms the most solid attempt made during the history of the Oxford Movement to create a philosophy of religion—comparable with it are Newman's University sermons, but these were only to be concluded in the 'Grammar of Assent'—and from this starting-point in a philosophy of religion to construct an ideal Church. The foundation of his whole view—and he is generous enough to offer it as a common basis for the whole High Church party—is thus formulated: 'that careful and individual moral discipline is the only possible foundation on which Christian faith and life can be built. The object of all real religion is personal sanctity and salvation.'[2] There is no space to show how these principles are carried out in detail. In themselves they contain nothing which most of the leaders of Neo-Anglicanism would have been unable to accept. The primacy of conscience Keble and Pusey, as well as Newman, must have admitted in principle. But his idea of obedience and submission as one of the fundamental conditions of sanctity makes the Reformation stand out as the chief manifestation in history of radical evil—in a prize competition for rancour against Luther, Ward would stand a good chance of taking first prize. Its principles he sees effective in the Church of England, which is drawn with an abundance of dark colours; while Rome, the Church of systematic training and professional

[1] W. Ward, *W. G. Ward*, pp. 237, 244. [2] Ward, *op. cit.* p. 248.

sanctity, comes so near the ideal, that he does not hesitate to demand that the utterances of the See of Rome in matters of doctrine should be free from 'our criticism and our commentaries.' The drop which made the cup overflow is that the author of this book, in a challenging manner, rejoices that in spite of everything he remains within the Church of England, and at finding 'the whole cycle of Roman doctrine gradually possessing numbers of English Churchmen.'

'The Ideal of a Christian Church' roused attention from many quarters.[1] The reaction in the Anglican University was inevitable; but perhaps it might have found worthier expression. The hostile attitude to the Oxford Movement of Dr. Symons, the Vice-Chancellor, who came into office in October 1844—he had been one of Pusey's judges—contributed to exasperate feeling. An attempt in Convocation to oppose his entry into office failed. The Hebdomadal Board, chiefly consisting of Heads of Houses, which under the presidency of the Vice-Chancellor had in its hands the immediate government of the University, proceeded to consider Ward's book, and on Dec. 13 apropos of it put out a proposal under three heads: (1) A series of quotations from 'The Ideal of a Christian Church' is declared incompatible with the Thirty-nine Articles. (2) Ward is to be deprived of his academical degrees. (3) A new declaration is introduced which should be required of such academic members as might fall under suspicion with regard to purity of doctrine, in the form that they accepted the Articles in the sense in which 'they were both first published and were now imposed by the University.'[2] The third measure did its best to make the issue doubtful. Liberals as well as High Churchmen of various types united in opposition to any new 'test.' So this measure was withdrawn, but at the eleventh hour a new project appeared: could not the situation be utilised to condemn Tract 90, wellnigh four

[1] It called forth Comte's admiration, and John Stuart Mill recognised with joy this illegitimate offspring of his spirit. Döllinger was much interested, and Gladstone, in the *Quarterly Review*, led the attack of Moderate High Churchmen. Newman, who had eagerly awaited the issue of the book, appears to have been disappointed, and in any case could not have accepted Ward's claim to remain an Anglican and yet be altogether Romanist.

[2] See Ward, pp. 292–347; Church, pp. 324–332; Liddon, vol. ii. pp. 416–440.

years after its appearance? This proposal was laid before Convocation at the same time as the two decrees against Ward. But this time too they had miscalculated the feeling of the Masters, who, resident or non-resident, had a vote in Convocation. Various voices had been raised in and out of Oxford—of non-residents the most notable being Gladstone—both against the haste with which the affair had been pushed on, and the indecency of censuring Newman when he had of his own accord given up his position in Oxford.

The voting took place on February 13. 'The Ideal of a Christian Church' was condemned by an overwhelming majority; Ward's degradation was carried by a narrow margin; the third proposal (about Tract 90) was vetoed by the two Proctors, who had this right according to the University statutes. The senior of the two, Guillemard, announced this: his junior colleague was R. W. Church. This only stopped the affair during the short remainder of their year of office, but the proposal was not repeated. An address of thanks to the Proctors was full of signatures of people who had no connection with the party.

Now the last phase had begun of the crisis which forms the termination of the Oxford Movement proper. In and through its *enfant terrible*, Ward, new High Anglicanism had suffered a severe blow, both within and without the University, and others and worse of another kind were soon to follow. Ward, who found it an appropriate time to get engaged, and afterwards married, was induced by his wife to give up the impossible position of a Papal Anglican. The secession of the pair did not take place till September 1845. The divergence between Ward and Newman, ill concealed during the years 1841–45, comes out in full light of day within the Roman Church.[1]

Oakeley went with Ward, after having by challenging declarations forced on his own suspension by the Court of Arches.[2] He found a refuge at Littlemore, and crossed the line a few weeks after Newman (Oct. 29). Others, of whom it will be enough to name Ambrose St. John, Dalgairns, and Faber,

[1] Ward died in 1882. His life as a Roman Catholic has been written by his son, W. Ward, *W. G. Ward and the Catholic Revival.*

[2] Liddon, *op. cit.* vol. ii. p. 439.

went over in the same year, others in the next. It was not a desertion *en masse*,[1] though some names were of great weight, But Newman's secession outweighed them all.

The building of *Via Media*, once so firmly compacted, so proud an edifice, lay in fragments, and its re-erection seemed inconceivable. But in the matter of the Church Newman left, his Ambrosian motto to 'A Grammar of Assent' was verified, *Non in dialectica complacuit Deo salvum facere populum suum*. The logical edifice seemed hopelessly destroyed. But under the ruins the forces of life were stirring, and the *Via Media* came out again, in living reality, no longer merely as a theoretic construction. It lived in the hearts of those who were faithful to their first love. It lived as seed in many minds. Above all, the twelve years of struggle and toil left behind in the Church of England fermenting germs, the strength and significance of which can only now be approximately judged. It remains now to examine the most important of these germs, the peculiar nature of the Neo-Anglican piety and the Church ideals, in which circumstances have caused it to take up its abode.

[1] Church, *op. cit.* p. 341, reckons fourteen names. Roman Catholic accounts give the total number of clerical converts in 1845 as twenty-three, and in 1846 as twenty-two, five being in America (Browne, *Annals of the Tractarian Movement*, pp. 100, 129).

# CHAPTER XI

## THE STATIC VIEW OF THE CHURCH

When the infatuate Council named of Trent
Clogg'd up the Catholic course of the true Faith,
Troubling the stream of pure antiquity,
And the wide channel in its bosom took
Crude novelties, scarce known as that of old ;
Then many a schism overleaped the banks,
Genevese, Lutheran, Scotch diversities.
Our Church, though straiten'd sore 'tween craggy walls,
Kept her true course, unchanging and the same,
Known by that ancient clearness, pure and free,
With which she sprung from 'neath the Throne of God.

ISAAC WILLIAMS, *The Church in England*.[1]

HE who attentively follows the personal development of Newman or H. Froude by the help of what they themselves wrote, cannot but be surprised to find in the early ' Tracts for the Times ' a single thought, which previously was only sporadic, suddenly proclaimed as the saving truth above all others, irksomely reiterated in almost identical terms, the idea of Apostolic Succession, of the true Episcopate as the condition of validity in the administration of the Sacraments, and the only sure guarantee for the preservation of right doctrine. In itself it was not a new or strange doctrine in the Church of England. The martyrdom of the Bishops under Queen Mary had at the most critical point of the English Reformation adorned the office they held with the martyr's crown, and fixed indelibly in the consciousness of the Church, reverence for the episcopal form of government.[2] The

[1] *Thoughts in Past Years* (Oxford, 1838), p. 263.

[2] A. J. Mason, *The Church of England and Episcopacy* (Cambridge, 1914), p. 23 ; cp. also Froude, *Remains*, vol. ii. p. 40 : ' It will be remembered by most persons that the reformed Church of England has given birth to two martyrs, an Archbishop and a King, and that these blessed Saints died for episcopacy.'

endeavour to preserve continuity with the past in other ways, and particularly in the matter of Church order, was equally typical of the conservative nature of the English Reformation. In this matter the judgment of antiquity seemed to be clearer and less ambiguous than in other points. Cranmer, in his preface to the Ordinal of 1552, maintained the threefold ministry as Biblical and Apostolical, and imposition of hands as an essential element in ordination; and in his adaptation of Justus Jonas' catechism of 1548 he laid down the doctrine of the conveyance of the spirit from Christ to the apostles, and from them to the whole series of their successors.[1] Nor can it have given Newman special trouble to put together a chain of Anglican witness from different times to the doctrine of Apostolic Succession,[2] even if, as always with the compilation of such *dicta probantia*, one can hardly avoid the suspicion that the context would sometimes have modified the bearing of the utterance. The best known of the old Anglican statements as to the necessity of Episcopacy, perhaps the first in which it is maintained as a Divine institution, must be a sermon by Archbishop Bancroft of 1589.[3] Nevertheless, there is a big gulf between the doctrine of *successio apostolica* in the older Anglican Church and that of Neo-Anglicanism. For partly we find statements from men to whom even the Tractarians looked up with undivided admiration, like Hooker[4] and Andrewes, etc., which plainly show their broader view and

[1] Mason, *op. cit.* p. 24.

[2] *Tracts for the Times*, No. 74; *Catena Patrum*, No. 1, *Testimony of Writers in the Later English Church to the Doctrine of the Apostolic Succession.* This does not include Cranmer, but begins with Bilson, Hooker, Bancroft, and ends with Jebb, van Mildert, and Mant. Amongst them is included Dr. Samuel Johnson, certainly not a contemptible witness. But what is perhaps his most drastic utterance is not quoted. According to Boswell, Johnson declared that he preferred Papal to Presbyterian religion.

Boswell: 'How so, sir?' Johnson: 'Why, sir, the Presbyterians have no Church, no apostolical ordination.' Boswell: 'And do you think that absolutely essential, sir?' Johnson: 'Why, sir, as it was an apostolical institution, I think it is dangerous to be without it' (G. B. Hill, vol. ii. p. 103).

[3] Mason, *op. cit.* p. 45; Henson, *Studies in English Religion*, p. 20.

[4] Hooker declared that 'the whole body of the Church hath power to alter, with general consent and upon necessary occasions, even the positive laws of the Apostles,' that cases might occur where an individual Church would be justified in acting without Bishops, 'and that therefore we are not simply to urge a lineal descent of power from the Apostles by continued succession of bishops in every effectual ordination' (Mason, *op. cit.* p. 69).

their dislike of making episcopacy a *sine qua non* for the existence of a Church as Church, and partly the idea of *successio* in the older Anglican Church, or their successors down to 1833, must be regarded in the first instance as one side of the fundamental principle of the authority of the old or undivided Church, and as one of the bonds that joined the present day to antiquity. It is to get a criterion as to where the true Catholic Church, the holder of the true tradition in the interpretation of Scripture is to be found, that Knox and Jebb have recourse to episcopacy.

In Daubeny the principle of Episcopal Succession is proclaimed with an emphasis and energy which approach the war-cry of the Tractarians, but in the older generation of Churchmen there were few (for instance, Bishop Phillpotts of Exeter) for whom the matter had more than an antiquarian interest. But as an historic fact, in the sense represented by, *e.g.*, Daubeny, it must have been doubted by nobody.

Newman states in 'Apologia,'[1] that it was an otherwise little known Fellow of Oriel, W. James, who about 1823 explained to him the doctrine of Apostolical Succession during a walk round Christ Church Meadow. 'I recollect being somewhat impatient of the subject at the time': it was during his evangelical period. Into the ideas of the Church which Newman gathered from his Noetic teachers, Whately in particular, who for himself energetically maintained the independent life of the Church against the State, this principle certainly did not enter, nor is there the least trace of the idea having meant anything for his religion before the Oxford Movement. Froude must probably have arrived before Newman at an independent view of the importance of the succession for maintaining the independence and authority of the Church. So he writes in 1831: 'Everyone admits the truth of the history which records the appointment of Christian teachers, and it is well known that to some among these teachers was committed the authority of ordaining successors to themselves. . . . Here, then, are a set of persons (the Bishops) who rest their claim to attention on their authority, not on their own personal qualifications, nor on the nature of their doctrines.'[2] In the summer of 1833

[1] *Apologia*, p. 67 (ed. 1908, p. 10).
[2] *Remains*, vol. i. part 2, p. 237.

we find, in a letter from Froude to an unnamed person[1]: 'His [it is not stated whose] notion is, that the most important subject to which you can direct your reading at present is the meaning of canonical obedience, which we have all sworn to our Bishops; for this is likely to be the only support of Church Government, when the State refuses to support it.' It is probably at the same time that he gives a friend, whose name the editors of 'Remains' have also suppressed, the advice, that if he thinks of writing on the revival of the doctrine of Apostolical Succession after the Reformation, he should make himself familiar with the utterances of Saravia, Hooker's friend, on the subject.[2]

One may therefore be fully justified in assuming that it was the pressure of the political situation, as above described, more than anything else—the necessity of finding a firm and unshakable foundation for a theory of the Church which could defy the assaults of the age, something objective in the deepest sense to put as a breakwater against what was regarded as the inundation of Liberal subjectivism, and also a short watchword as a signal and a standard in the hourly struggle—which made them catch at the principle of Apostolical Succession, sever it from the complex of ideas which gives it its correct import, and give it a formulation, the somewhat violent simplification of which was made possible by the absence of all disposition to a critical view of history. So it was strategic rather than religious reasons which gave the idea of Apostolical Succession its dominant place in the static Church conception of Neo-Anglicanism.[3] Even after it became the received watchword, it is only exceptionally that one finds the idea utilised in the

[1] July 30 (*Remains*, vol. i. part 2, p. 319). Cp. p. 322, where Froude speaks of a sermon he had written, not, as far as I can see, included in *Remains*: 'My subject is the duty of contemplating the contingency of a separation between Church and State and of providing against it, *i.e.* by studying the principle of ecclesiastical subordination, so that when the law of the land ceases to enforce this, we may have a law within ourselves to supply its place.'

[2] *Ibid.* vol. i. part 2, p. 325.

[3] An interesting witness of this is given by Newman himself in his later Roman period, when, in *Lectures on Difficulties of Anglicans*, vol. i. p. 102, he emphasises the fact that at the beginning of the movement the leading idea was the independence of the Church. They took refuge in *successio apostolica* and all that goes with it, 'not only because these things were true and right but in order to shake off the State.'

purely religious literature of the movement. Yet it did not remain a merely external symbol, raised to muster the faithful in the hour of need, and lowered when the danger was averted. The connection between the external action and the religious awakening, the intensification of the religious life, which was the deepest content of the Oxford Movement, ended in burning the idea into the consciousness of the movement in an almost indelible fashion. Even long after the idea had been put back by theologians into the connection where it properly belongs—this happened in part during the Oxford Movement —even after the untenableness of the construction of history, on which it rests, had been displayed, *successio apostolica* has remained the shibboleth of Neo-Anglicanism, which sometimes the lips cannot cease to repeat, even after the brain has become aware of the limits of its importance.

It must have been at a meeting between Newman, Keble, Froude, and Palmer in Oxford, in the summer of 1833, probably at the beginning of August, that they decided to make *successio* the corner-stone of the fortress that they were proposing to build. The programme then agreed on contains, as the first among six points, the doctrine of the Apostolical Succession as a practical basic principle ('as a rule of practice'), and from this principle are derived three others: (1) that participation in the Body and Blood of Christ is essential for the maintenance of the Christian life and hope in each individual; (2) that this participation is communicated to individual Christians *only* by the hands of the Apostles' successors and their delegates; (3) that the successors of the Apostles are those who descend from them in 'straight line by the imposition of hands, and that their delegates are the priests whom each has commissioned.'[1]

This is the simple scheme of the apostolical doctrine. It was expressed in clear and concise formulation in the little catechism, which was one of the few abiding results of the Hadleigh meeting: 'The Churchman's Manual; or Questions and Answers on the Church, on Protestant and Romish Dissenters.'[2] Here the duty is specially inculcated of

[1] A. P. Perceval, *A Collection of Papers connected with the Theological Movement of* 1833 (2nd ed., London, 1843), p. 12.

[2] Printed in Perceval, *op. cit.* pp. 51–63.

remaining in communion with the Apostles by participation in the Sacrament, *i.e.* the Sacrament as administered by those who have apostolical authority to do so.[1] But we have to go to the early 'Tracts' to find the apostolical idea preached with real enthusiasm. The first of these has already been quoted in another context. Scarcely any of the later ones approach it in vigour and effectiveness. To give a broader and more documented presentation of what was meant by the doctrine of the Bishops' apostolical office fell to the lot of J. W. Bowden in Tract 5.[2] With the words of the Nicene Creed for motto, 'I believe one Catholick and Apostolick Church,' he sketches the historical foundations of the theory. The Sacrament requires an office with special authority for its administration. This authority must have been given by the Founder of the Sacrament, Christ Himself. Afterwards the office of Deacon was instituted by the Apostles (Acts vi.), to whose duties belonged not merely the distribution of alms, but the administration of Baptism (Acts viii.). When the expansion of the Church made it necessary the Apostles instituted another office of 'Presbyters' or Bishops as their delegates, but retained the general oversight of the congregations. Thus the Church constitution was complete as long as the Apostles lived. But it was desirable to create an organ for propagating the order of the Church, and to hand on the peculiar commission of the Spirit and the Lord. The Apostles did this by setting certain persons over certain Churches, with apostolical authority, though locally limited, as Timothy was set over the Church of Ephesus, and Titus over the congregations in Crete. These are therefore the first holders of the Bishop's office in the proper or later sense, though at first they were designated by various names

[1] Here we find already the typically Tractarian view of Roman Catholics as a species of dissenters. Question 34: 'Are all Christians in England members of the Church?'—Answer: 'No.' Question 35: 'Are all Christians in England, who are not members of the Church, united in one body?'—Answer: 'No; they are divided into a great variety of sects, but may all be classed under two heads.' Question 36: 'What are these?'—Answer: 'Protestant Dissenters and Romish Dissenters.'

[2] 'A Short Address to his Brethren on the Nature and Constitution of the Church of Christ, and of the Branch of it established in England, by a Layman.' Cp. W. Palmer, *A Treatise on the Church of Christ* (London, 1838), vol. ii. p. 382.

(Evangelists, Angels). That the first Bishops are Apostles, though with locally limited authority, is expounded in other passages of the Tracts.

It is unnecessary here to enter on a criticism of the view of history on which this construction rests. That it is untenable needs scarcely to be pointed out. But it is not without interest to observe how, now, as in the early Church, it is the urgent need of a position of defence which gives the doctrine of *successio* its significance ; now the enemy was political and religious Liberalism, then it was Gnosticism. In one point the Neo-Anglican doctrine on succession definitely diverges from the primitive one : in the primitive Church it was the chain of holders of the same Bishop's throne, which had to be maintained, and which formed the guarantee of the apostolicity of the traditional doctrine, while Neo-Anglicanism seeks the connection between consecrators and consecrated. This misconception, which has given a mechanical hardness and superficial institutional character to the Neo-Anglican view, has in a striking manner been displayed by a contemporary English theologian.[1]

Though Keble makes his excellent parishioner Richard Nelson (in Tract 12) deduce the doctrine of the threefold ministry and *successio apostolica* from his New Testament, one can scarcely avoid the impression that the Tractarian leaders felt the weakness of the proof which can be drawn from Scripture in support of their conception of the Church. Though Newman himself, in Tract 11, ' The Visible Church,' puts together a series of texts in proof that there existed a visible external Church with well-defined offices and functions in the time of the Apostles, he leaves to others the explicit proof from Scripture which is required to convince the contemporary Church. After a less important attempt by Keble in Tract 4, ' Adherence to the Apostolical Succession the Safest Course,' it is done more thoroughly by B. Harrison in Tract 24, ' The Scripture View of the Apostolic Commission.'

[1] C. H. Turner, ' Apostolic Succession,' in *Essays on the Early History of the Church and the Ministry*, edited by H. B. Swete (Oxford, 1918). In the second edition of this book edited by Turner, he has attempted to confute the awkward inferences on modern Anglicanism that were drawn from his investigation. Cp. A. C. Headlam, *The Doctrine of the Church and Christian Reunion* (London, 1920), p. 127.

In His High-Priestly prayer (John xvii.) Christ Himself lays the foundation of the one, holy Apostolic Church. It is authority which is the special mark of the Apostles, not the wonderful 'charismata.' It is with the support of his apostolic authority that St. Paul reproaches the Corinthians with their disunion; the maintenance of unity is the chief task of the apostolic office. A chief source of the Tractarian Scriptural proof is of course the pastoral epistles. Here, it is believed, is evidence how the apostolic authority is transferred to the next generation. St. Paul warns Timothy: 'Wherefore I put thee in remembrance, that thou stir up the gift of God which is in thee by the putting on of my hands' (2 Tim. i. 6). The office that Timothy has received he is also to commit to others (2 Tim. ii. 2). Thus incessantly the holy chain is continued, and incessantly the Body of Christ is edified.

But the proof from Scripture is comparatively of minor importance. Succession is a historical fact, Newman assures us in Tract 7, 'The Episcopal Church Apostolical,' a fact which scarcely needs to be further proved. 'Every link in the chain is known, from St. Peter to our present Metropolitans. Here then I only ask, looking at this plain fact by itself, is there not something of a divine providence in it? can we conceive that this Succession has been preserved, all over the world, amid many revolutions, through many centuries, *for nothing*?' The schism from Rome caused no break, continuity was preserved by the English episcopate, though Rome's claim to dominance was rejected. It was a province of the Church which maintained its independence, like Cyprus against Antioch, 431—and the defence of Cyprus in the Council of Ephesus is also a defence of England.[1]

The tone of the early Tracts is generally one of irreconcilable hostility to Rome. Even though Rome, more than any other society, has preserved the reality of the visible Church—even though the attentive observer cannot fail to see the greatness of the Roman system and sigh, 'Cum talis esses, utinam noster esses,' yet reunion is impossible. Rome is infected with heresy. We are bound to shun her as the plague. Is it not a special proof of God's Providence that He has preserved a Branch of the Christian

[1] Tract No. 15, *On the Apostolical Succession in the English Church*, pp. 7 f.

Church, free both from heresy and ecclesiastical disorganisation? 'Thus in every quarter of the world, from North America to New South Wales, a Zoar has been provided for those who would fain escape Sodom, and yet dread to be without shelter.'[1] The anti-Roman attitude brings with it, at least in the more moderate Tractarians (in contrast with *e.g.* Froude), a quite appreciative attitude towards the men of the Reformation, though regret is expressed that they did not use the first possibility to put themselves under orthodox Bishops with Apostolical Succession.[2] 'Nothing, as far as we can judge, was more likely to have preserved them from that great decline of religion which has taken place on the Continent.'

'Next, consider how *natural* is the doctrine of a Succession. When an individual comes to me, claiming to speak in the name of the Most High, it is natural to ask him for his authority. . . . In the case of the Catholic Church, the person referred to, *i.e.* the Bishop, has received it from a predecessor, and he from another, and so on, till we arrive at the Apostles themselves, and thence Our Lord and Saviour. . . . Lastly, the *argument from Scripture* is surely quite clear to those who honestly wish direction for *practice.* Christ promised He should be with His Apostles always, as ministers of His religion, even unto the end of the world. In one sense the Apostles were to be alive till He came again; but they all died at the natural time. Does it not follow that there are those now alive who represent them? Now, who were the most probable representatives of them in the generation next their death?'[3] Here we have come upon a line of argument which above all others is typically Tractarian, the proof from probability.

It is alluded to in formal scheme by Newman in Tract 11,

[1] Newman, Tract No. 20, *The Visible Church*, vol. iii. p. 3. The continuation puts in clear light the narrowness of Newman's Anglicanism in comparison with that of Knox. Knox valued highly the apostolicity of the English Church, but did not leave out of sight reunion with other Churches as the ultimate goal it should serve. But Newman continues in the Tract quoted: 'With this reflection before us, does it not seem to be utter ingratitude to an astonishing Providence of God's mercy, . . . to attempt unions with those who have separated from the Church, to break down the partition-walls, and to argue as if religion were altogether and only a matter of each man's private concern?'

[2] Tract 15, *On the Apostolical Succession in the English Church* (by W. Palmer, but edited by Newman), pp. 10 f.

[3] Tract No. 7, p. 3.

'The Visible Church, I.' After having quoted passages of Scripture to prove that a visible Church existed in the Apostles' days, he goes on and attempts to prove 'that the visible Church, thus instituted by the Apostles, was intended to continue. . . . The *onus probandi* lies with those who deny this position. If the doctrines and precepts already cited (in support of the authority of the Apostolic Church) are obsolete at this day, the same holds good of, *e.g.*, 1 Peter ii. 13, or Matt. vii. 14, John iii. 3.[1] Is it likely so elaborate a system should be framed, yet with no purpose of its continuing?' But Newman also devoted a special Tract to the proof of probability: 'On Arguing concerning the Apostolical Succession' (No. 19). He starts from Bishop Butler's principle of probability[2]: 'the faintest probabilities are strong enough to determine our *conduct* in a matter of duty.' Therefore, 'if there be but a reasonable likelihood of our pleasing Christ more by keeping than by not keeping to the fellowship of the Apostolic Ministry, this of course ought to be enough to lead those who think themselves moved to undertake the Sacred Office, to seek for a licence to do so from it.'

A similar line of reasoning was followed also by Froude, at the time when the idea of succession first seems to have begun to occupy his thoughts,[3] and later we hear him proclaim that in all doubtful cases, where Scripture admits the

[1] This negative proof is also used by Newman in Tract No. 45, *The Grounds of our Faith*. If Church government is not definitely laid down in Scripture, this is true in a higher degree of, *e.g.*, the doctrine of the Trinity. 'Let a man consider whether all the objections which he argues against the Scripture argument for Episcopacy, may not be turned against his own belief in the Trinity.'

[2] In *Apologia* (p. 67) Newman quoted the principle of probability as one of the two principal doctrines he got from Butler's *Analogy*; cp. a sermon on 'Subjection of the Reason and the Feelings to the Revealed Word' in *Parochial and Plain Sermons*, vol. vi. p. 255. For a thorough and spiteful criticism of the application of the principle by the Oxford School see E. A. Abbott, *Philomythus. An Antidote against Credulity* (London, 1891).

[3] *Remains*, vol. i. p. 239: 'In a case where the arguments seem in any way balanced, where there seems nearly as good a chance that one opinion be right as another, this additional presumption in favour of what the Church teaches, should be sufficient to decide a prudent man to continue in those things which he had been taught and assured of, knowing of whom he had learnt them.' It needs scarcely to be emphasised that the proof from probability of the Oxford School, with its presumption in favour of the more difficult possibility, is in characteristic contrast to the Jesuit probabilism.

possibility of two different interpretations, 'the more reverential side' is always the safe course.[1] Once he expresses the same thoughts in a telling illustration: a man who, when he comes of age, hears from those who were present at his father's death-bed, that he made certain oral dispositions of his property, but cannot find them in the will—is he acting dutifully if, in literal obedience to the witness of the will, he neglects these statements?[2] The application of this to the relations of Christians to the letter of Scripture and tradition as to Church order is obvious.

It is a question here of more than a certain way of giving reasons for a certain conception of the Church: it is a question of listening anxiously to catch from tradition the hints that it may contain of what was God's purpose with His Church. The risk of acting on slight grounds is small compared with the risk of neglecting anything which is a genuine legacy from the Master. Newman once, with his mastery of imagery, compared the visible Church to a memorial, which Christ left behind Him, when He ascended to Heaven, and 'let drop from Him as the mantle of Elijah the pledge and token of His never-failing grace from age to age.'[3] If it is the case that Christ left the mantle of His glory behind Him on earth, must not he, who takes hold of a lappet of it, necessarily seek for more? Thus in this typically Tractarian process of thought, which we have seen hitherto applied to giving the justification of the static conception of the Church, there is contained the seed of the progressive.[4]

But our next task is to notice how the chief point in the

[1] *Remains*, vol. ii. part 1, p. 97.

[2] *Ibid.* vol. ii. part 1, p. 79.

[3] Sermon of May 14, 1837, *Parochial and Plain Sermons*, vol. iv. p. 174.

[4] We find the same thought applied not only to doctrine but to Church order, with express emphasis of 'anxiety and watchfulness' as notes of the temper with which the Christian must administer the Church's inheritance; thus, *e.g.*, in Newman's sermon (1834) on 'The Gospel, a Trust committed to Us': we cannot precisely know what doctrines are necessary; therefore it is better to go too far in conscientiousness (*Parochial and Plain Sermons*, vol. ii. No. 22, p. 271); cp. also in a sermon on 'The Gospel Witnesses' (*ibid.* vol. ii. No. 17, p. 203): 'It is our duty to search diligently after every jot and tittle of the Truth graciously revealed to us, and to maintain it.' Cp. also a sermon of Keble, 'Our Primitive Tradition recognised in Holy Scripture,' *Sermons Academical and Occasional* (Oxford, 1847), pp. 188, 203. The thought is fullest in Newman, Tract No. 85, *Lectures on the Scripture Proof of the Doctrines of the Church.*

static conception of the Church, the Apostolic Succession, was partly made the basis of popular preaching, partly fitted into a more thought-out structure.

In the actual series of the Tracts we have several attempts to preach *successio*. The most effective is Newman's, in Tract 10, 'Heads of a Week-day Lecture delivered to a Country Congregation in ——shire.' The time is just before SS. Simon and Jude's Day: so the Apostolic theme is provided. The Apostles were like Christ, His successors in His sufferings. The Apostles are dead, but just as a man lives in his heirs, so the Apostles live in their spiritual descendants, the Bishops. They are Apostles to us, though in doctrine they are bound by the words of the Apostles, and they suffer like them in imitation of Christ. 'The meetingers[1] have no head, they are all of them mixed together in a confused way; but we of Christ's Holy Church (blessed be God!), have one Bishop over us, and our Bishop is the Bishop of ——. Many of you have seen him lately, when he confirmed in our church. That very *confirmation* is another ordinance, in which the Bishop witnesses Christ. Our Lord and Saviour confirms us with the Spirit in all goodness; the Bishop is His figure and likeness, when he lays his hands upon the heads of children.' The Bishop is Christ's instrument in the rule of the Church. By reason of the Bishop's appointment of the Ministers of the Word, it is through him that the news of redemption and the means of grace come to all men.[2] 'I, who speak to you concerning Christ, was ordained to do so by the Bishop; he speaks in me—as Christ wrought in him and as God sent Christ. Thus the whole plan of salvation hangs together.' We recognise once more the metallic trumpet-note of Tract I. One may ask whether, at any

[1] As a proof against Dissent see especially Tracts Nos. 29 and 30, *Christian Liberty, or Why should we Belong to the Church of England?* (J. W. Bowden). See also Newman, Tract No. 47, *The Visible Church*, IV.: that Christ's overflowing mercy works even outside the Apostolic Church, must not conflict with 'the placing of its fulness in a certain ordained Society and Ministry'; cp. *Lyra Apostolica*, No. 108, 'Schism.'

[2] Cp. J. Keble in a sermon to Confirmation candidates in *Plain Sermons by Contributors to the Tracts for the Times*, vol. vii. p. 142: 'The consecrated hands of the Bishop are, we hope, soon to be spread over you, in token of the presence and outstretched wings of that Dove which descended on Our Saviour.'

time in the history of the Church, the office of Bishop has been so immoderately exalted to the clouds as in these early Tracts.

It is, however, surprising to how small an extent the idea of Apostolic Succession left its traces behind in Newman's sermons, the noblest memorial we possess of the Tractarian type of religion. This seems best to show how preponderantly this idea belonged to the polemic armoury, not to the inner closet of living faith. At times, however, with rapturous eloquence, he can utilise this *motif*, and give colour and life to it, as when he speaks of ' The Visible Church, an Encouragement to Faith.' What is Christ's Church, he asks, ' but a pledge and proof of God's never-dying love and power from age to age ? . . . He set it up on the foundation of His Twelve Apostles, and promised that the gates of hell should not prevail against it ; and its presence among us is a proof of His power. . . . The royal dynasty of the Apostles is far older than all the kingly families which are now on the earth. Every Bishop of the Church whom we behold is a lineal descendant of St. Peter and St. Paul after the order of a spiritual birth—a noble thought, if we could realise it.' In spite of the unworthiness of individual Bishops and their neglect to maintain their spiritual birthright, yet the Bishop is ' not the less inspiring an object to a believing mind, which sees in each of them the earnest of His promise, "I will never leave thee, nor forsake thee." . . . He has continued the line of His Apostles onwards through every age, and all troubles and perils of the world. Here then surely is somewhat of encouragement for us amid our loneliness and weakness. The presence of every Bishop suggests a long history of conflicts and trials, sufferings and victories, hopes and fears, through many centuries. His presence at this day is the fruit of them all. He is the living monument of those who are dead. He is the promise of a bold fight and a good confession and a cheerful martyrdom now, if needful, as was instanced in those of old time. We see their figures on our walls, and their tombs are under our feet ; and we trust, nay we are sure, that God will be to us in our day what He was to them.'[1]

[1] *Parochial and Plain Sermons* (August 14, 1834), vol. iii. No. 17, p. 246 ; cp. also the sermons ' The Christian Ministry ' (*ibid.* vol. ii. p. 25) and ' The Fellowship of the Apostles ' (*ibid.* vol. vi. p. 14).

But it seems to have been only during the first period of the movement that the idea of succession could call forth something of real rapture, and could obtain a positive religious value. In Newman's sermons it is soon put aside by other and deeper, more intensely religious thoughts on the nature of the Church.

A bridge between the first years with their one-sided and perhaps not fully considered proclamation of the Apostolic Succession as the rock, to which the Church had to take refuge in order to resist the storms of the age, and the later systematised conception of the Church is formed by the two Tracts by Newman, that bear the famous name *Via Media*.[1] These are in the form of a dialogue between *Laicus*, who brings forward the popular reproaches of Popery which are directed against the apostolic system, and *Clericus*, who answers by putting the question, whether a second Reformation was not required. The first Reformation consisted in recovering the primitive principles, which the Roman Church had hidden and distorted; but now the great body of the clergy has departed from the doctrines which were preached by our martyrs at the Reformation. Who now takes the Prayer Book rubrics to the letter, who holds daily services, or observes Saints' Days or Fast Days? It is a question of going back to the standpoint of the true English Reformation, with its root in Scripture and the Primitive Church, in opposition to the 'foreign party' that developed with Puritanism, while the Reformation is merely a part of the Church's inheritance. 'I cannot consent, I am sure the reformers did not wish me, to deprive myself of the Church's dowry, the doctrines which the Apostles spoke in Scripture and impressed upon the early Church. I receive the Church as a messenger from Christ, rich in treasures, old and new, rich with the accumulated wealth of ages.'[2] Into this the Reformation enters as a part, and the Thirty-nine Articles, which properly are to be regarded as a rejection of contemporary abuses, are to be retained, though they require an appendix to free them from the misinterpretation of later times. But in the Liturgy is found the

[1] Tracts Nos. 38 and 41, later reprinted together with *Lectures on the Prophetical Office of the Church*, with *Via Media* as common title.

[2] *Via Media* (ed. 1908), vol. ii. p. 31.

bond which unites the Church of to-day with that of primitive antiquity. Its spirit is quite irreconcilable with that of modern Protestantism. It is the same line of thought we found in Knox, still without exaggerated sharpness.

In the Tracts on the *Via Media* written in 1834, the perspective has thus been widened: *successio apostolica* is here only one side of the conception of the Church which is on the point of being shaped. The historical sketch has shown us how the need of a broader foundation, a deepening of theory, came in, as soon as the first fierceness of controversy was toned down. The object is in the main the same, to maintain the objective nature of the Church against the age's well-meant or malicious attempt at recasting. But it had to be widened to include the whole fabric of the Church, had to affect preaching and doctrine as much as external ordinances.

How the tenaciously preserved external ordinances of the Church are a guarantee against one-sided narrowness of doctrine, how these ordinances contain in themselves the possibility, after times of rationalism and spiritual drought, of restoring a connection with the richer life of the past, had already been eloquently set forth by one of the less known of the brotherhood.[1] In a series of 'Sermons for Saints' Days and Holy Days,'[2] Keble takes up the idea of succession as found in the primitive Church as in the first place a guarantee of the preservation of pure doctrine,[3] and finds a negative proof of its correctness not merely in the early Fathers' statements about heretics, but also in the religious position in the Protestant Churches, which gave up the succession, in Holland,

[1] C. P. Eden (vicar of St. Mary's 1843–50, Fellow of Oriel 1833–51, one of Burgon's *Twelve Good Men*). Tract No. 32, *The Standing Ordinances of Religion*: 'Can you possibly imagine any better method of *perpetuating doctrine* than by ordinances, which live on like monuments? . . . *e.g.* a generation of ungodly men (suppose) rise and possess the earth. . . . But meanwhile *something* is living on in the very midst of them, independent of the variable opinions of the human mind, something which they cannot spoil, and which . . . will come forth pure and unsullied, full of sweetness and edifying comfort to the remnant which shall then rise up, who will feed upon it by faith, and form anew the living temple of the Holy Ghost, in their generation. . . . Thus the consecrated form of religion will be like some fair statue, which lies buried for ages, but comes forth at length, as beautiful as ever.'

[2] Tracts Nos. 52, 54, 57, 60.

[3] Tract No. 54, *The Annunciation of the Blessed Virgin Mary.*

Germany, and Scotland—nay even the doctrinal errors of Rome are connected with the attempt to make the episcopate merely an organ of Papacy.[1]

Thus it is, as was before pointed out, the polemic against Rome, which gave rise to the most important attempt to systematize static Anglicanism, to define *Via Media*: Newman's 'Lectures on the Prophetical Office of the Church, viewed relatively to Romanism and Popular Protestantism.' It is in the nature of the case that the standpoint here maintained has not the fascination of originality. The aim of the author is not to find a new ground to stand on, but to fix firmly the old ground, which even at the beginning of the nineteenth century was maintained by the old-fashioned High Church party and by the forerunners of Neo-Anglicanism. It is a question of formulating afresh the classical Anglican theory of Antiquity, of the undivided early Church as the highest court of appeal, thus no longer the chain of succession as an isolated fact, but its restoration in a wider context, whose guarantee and outward sign it originally designed to be. Now what takes the first place is not the Apostolic commission, but the *quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus*. The principle was old: what was new, was the attempt to rest a whole system upon it. Would it succeed? 'When we confess our *Via Media* as the very truth the Apostles preached, we seem to be merely archaeologists and pedants, amusing ourselves with illusions or learned sophisms and unable to take hold of things as they are.'[2] It is a question of making the theory a practical principle. This attempt is carried out in the first instance with regard to doctrine, preaching, 'the prophetical office.'

The main lines of the argumentation are partly familiar to us already. The Protestant is right in pointing to the Bible as the source of all revelation. But he is wrong when he makes the interpretation of the Bible an affair of the individual, when he rejects tradition altogether. Is not Scripture itself tradition written down? What but tradition has handed it on to us, and can guarantee its lofty origin? But tradition, on the other hand, is not what Romanists

[1] Tract No. 57 (St. Mark's Day).

[2] *Prophetical Office* (ed. 1837), p. 20; *Via Media* (ed. 1901), vol. i. p. 17.

make of it. The proof of this can only be carried out on the basis of a thorough-going study of the primitive Church. To carry this proof to the conclusion that Rome has set aside the authority of antiquity is the first task of the book. But the argumentation against 'popular Protestantism' leads deeper to the very foundation principle. First comes the question of the relation between private judgment and the authority of the society. Here, too, must a *Via Media* be found between extremes: the demand of Protestantism that the individual should have the right and the duty of himself examining and interpreting Scripture, on the one hand, and on the other the demand of Rome for unconditional submission to the society in everything; between, on the one side, a view of the Church as nothing but a collection of individuals, of whom some are God's witnesses in a higher degree than others, but taken all together never are or were anything but a collection of fallible men, and on the other side the maintenance of Romanism not merely of the authority but of the absolute infallibility of the Church. *Via Media* cannot bind the individual in every detail, but on the essential points where the Church's witness is unambiguous, as in respect to the Trinity, Incarnation, and the like, the individual must submit. And he must employ all the means at his disposal to obtain the knowledge of God's will. What is primary is never a free examination, but first comes authority in the instruction of parents and the teaching of the Church. Then the experiences of the moral life become helpful, as does the direct study of Scripture, but as a witness of the Church and the moral experiences, and interpreted with their assistance. Last of all comes, but only for a few, the study of the early Church and of common Christianity as a whole.[1] So may the authority of the Church and the judgment of the individual be brought into harmony. The Church demands acceptance of the doctrine of the Apostles as an objective fact given by revelation, and leaves the individual free to form his views on the remaining points. The whole problem thus centres on establishing the content of the doctrine of the Apostles. On the basis of Scripture alone no concord can be reached. Therefore other sources of knowledge must be called in—especially

[1] *Prophetical Office*, pp. 156 f.

the early Church. But its importance lies not merely in the fact that it is a means of arriving at the real apostolic doctrine, but rests chiefly on the fact that the Catholic Church, both according to the witness of the Creeds[1] and of Scripture,[2] has the promise of infallibility in matters of faith. But this holds good only as long as it preserved its unity—it ceased in and with the Church's internal divisions. It is plain what intensity this view must give and actually has given to the longing for Church Reunion. But this is not the place for developing this point.[3] So the most important task must be to define the extent and manner of this infallible consensus.

It is certainly an exaggeration when English theologians maintain the thought of the authority of the primitive Church to be an exclusively Anglican theory.[4] It is outside the limits of our enquiry to go fully into a comparison with the Continental Protestant idea of 'consensus quinquesaecularis,' which is the basis of Melanchthon's Traditionalism,[5] and was later taken up by the seventeenth-century syncretists [6] and played a great part generally in the more humanistic side of the Reformation. It was certainly no exclusive hall-mark of the Anglican Reformation, though it was from the beginning strongly emphasised in England, in proportion to the greater measure of humanistic influence. However, old Anglicanism as a rule took care not to attach more than a secondary importance to primitive tradition.[7] Nor could any agreement be arrived at as to where the limit of antiquity should be fixed. Newman himself mentions the different limits that were given. Ken holds with the undivided Church down to the schism between East and West. Bramhall says five centuries, Jewel six, and authoritative documents of the Reformation age vary between the time before

[1] The Twentieth Article and the Athanasian Creed.

[2] 1 Tim. iii. 15; Eph. iv. 11–14; Is. lix. 21.

[3] 'The unbroken succession of the Church's orders may be the tenure on which the sacred mysteries of faith are continued to us' (*ibid.* p. 240).

[4] See, *e.g.*, W. R. Inge, *Faith*, pp. 96 f.

[5] O. Ritschl, *Dogmengeschichte des Protestantismus* (Leipzig, 1908), vol. i. pp. 291, 300.

[6] K. Müller, *Kirchengeschichte* (Tübingen, 1919), vol. ii. 2. p. 585.

[7] See, *e.g.*, Waterland, *The Use and Value of Ecclesiastical Antiquity*: 'Antiquity ought to attend as a handmaid to Scripture, to wait upon her as her mistress; to keep off *intruders* from making bold with her, and to discourage strangers from misrepresenting her' (*Works*, vol. v. p. 257).

Gregory I and the time up to Chalcedon. For his own part he does not go farther than to put the boundary of antiquity somewhere between 343 (Council of Sardica) and 787 (the seventh oecumenical council according to the Orthodox Church), but in any case with the chief emphasis on the first four centuries.[1]

So we must go to this period for the witness of 'the Faith which was once delivered to the Saints,' that Faith which is ever to remain in the world, which is the treasure and life of the Church, the qualification of membership, and the rule of Her teaching.'[2] This faith is none other than the Church Creeds, the Apostles' and the Nicene first and foremost, which are to be regarded as different formulations of the same apostolic truth. No other formulations of doctrine can have any but a secondary importance in comparison with these: the Thirty-nine Articles are not 'Articles of Faith' in the proper sense, nor a condition of lay-membership of the Church. It is Rome's mistake to have elevated secondary formularies as necessary for salvation.

So far Newman's position may be regarded as typical of static Anglicanism to the present day.[3] But beside this, and as a complement to it, we find here already a conception of tradition, which points beyond the limits of the static idea. Beside the obligatory rules of faith, there is 'what may be called Prophetical Tradition. Almighty God placed in this Church first Apostles, secondarily Prophets. Apostles rule and preach, Prophets expound. Prophets or Doctors are the interpreters of the Revelation. . . . Their teaching is a vast system . . . pervading the Church like an atmosphere, irregular in its shape, from its very profusion and exuberance. . . . This I call Prophetical Tradition, existing primarily in the bosom of the Church itself, and recorded in such measure as Providence has determined, in the writings of eminent men.' It seems evident that here we are face to face with an idea of the Church which is capable

[1] Cp. also Pusey's explanation, *A Letter to Richard, Lord Bishop of Oxford* (4th ed., Oxford, 1840), pp. 43 f.

[2] *Prophetical Office*, p. 277 (*Via Media* (ed. 1901), vol. i. p. 233).

[3] It may be worth pointing out how the movement for a World Conference on *Faith and Order*, typically Anglican in its outset, aims at building on a return to 'the Faith which was once delivered to the Saints.'

of deepening the historical outlook—which opens wider perspectives than the purely static idea—which, if extended in its full width to apply to all Christendom, not merely its episcopal part, would give a grand outlook on the history of revelation, but also that we have here the embryo of the process of thought which, when completed, was to appear in 'The Idea of Development in Doctrine.' The same tendency may also be traced in the attempt to draw a line between the authority of Scripture and that of Tradition, or rather the failure of this attempt. Certainly the definition which Newman in 'Apologia' admits that he received from Hawkins[1] is still laid down, *i.e.* that it is tradition which imparts doctrines, but in Scripture we have only the proof of them. But as, on the one hand, God's Word is not with Protestants limited to the written word,[2] on the other the chief proof of the divine revelation of the written word is the witness of the oldest Church Fathers,[3] the chief barrier between Scripture and Tradition is broken down, and Scripture itself becomes in a measure part of tradition. Even here it must be granted that the tendency to break through staticism has in it the seed of a historical conception in a deeper sense, but that this also was a weak point in the defensive work against Rome, which the lectures on 'The Prophetical Office of the Church' designed to raise.

The definition of the static conception of the Church was not an affair of the creative genius—we have seen this with or against its will bound to overstep its limits—but of the less imaginative student. It is scarcely requisite here to enter into a full analysis of the dry systematic treatment by W. Palmer in his 'Treatise on the Church of Christ: Designed chiefly for the Use of Students in Theology.'[4] This learned and exhaustive work, with its careful definition of the different notes of the Church, its academic refutations of all objections, its maintenance of the apostolic office as essential for the

[1] *Apologia*, p. 66 (ed. 1908, p. 9).

[2] *Prophetical Office*, p. 328 (*Via Media*, vol. i. p. 275).

[3] 'If asked then how I know that the Bible contains all truth necessary to be believed in order to salvation, I simply reply, as the first Homily implies, that the early Church so accounted it, that there is a consent of Catholic Fathers in its favour' (*ibid.* p. 339; *Via Media* (ed. 1901), vol. i. p. 284).

[4] 2 vols., London, 1838.

Church's existence,[1] must be one of the most narrow-minded productions of Anglican theology. All the notes of the true Church are pointed to in the Church of England. Rome is no doubt also a limb of the visible Church, though without any advantage over other Churches ('if it alone were the Catholic Church, Christianity would certainly have reached its lowest ebb and Hell's gates prevailed against it'). And it has justification only in the countries that have always remained Roman. When the Roman Church intrudes Latin Bishops into Eastern Sees, it is guilty of schism; the same would be the case with every Church which sought to win a foothold, *e.g.*, in South America, which has been Roman since the introduction of Christianity. But this also applies to the Papists in North America, and—'the Romish or Popish party in England and Ireland, who fell from the Catholic Church in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, and have not ceased to rage against her ever since.'[2] The Oriental Churches have all the outward notes which belong to a part of the true Church. The Reformers, Luther in particular, had no thought of separating from the visible Church. But the reformed Churches of the Continent are so defective in their notes of a true Church, by their break with antiquity, their ambiguous position towards the need of personal holiness, by the loss of Apostolic Succession, that these 'societies of Lutherans and Calvinists could not have been considered as Churches of Christ, properly speaking.' It is not without purpose that the author uses the past tense. He adds an explanation

[1] The following comprehensive reasoning deserves to be quoted because it sums up static Anglicanism's proof of its idea of the Church: 'It is certain from what has been said that the Christian Ministry must always exist, and can never have failed. It is certain that the essence of this Ministry consisted mainly in a divine commission, and that the ministry of the Church must have always possessed it. It is equally certain that the mode by which this commission was conveyed, must always be essentially the *same*. Now the apostolic mode of ordination, by which the Apostles and their successors, the Bishops of the universal Church, sent forth the ministers of Jesus Christ, by imposition of hands and prayer: this mode *alone* has *always* existed in the Church. It is therefore evidently the external vocation instituted by God Himself. If it be not so; if it be a mode of human invention; it could never have constituted ministers of Christ, and therefore the whole Church would for many ages have been without true ministers, it would have been deficient in what is essential to the Church of Christ, and therefore the Catholic Church must have *entirely failed*: a position which is directly and formally heretical' (*op. cit.* vol. i. p. 373).

[2] *Op. cit.* vol. i. p. 305.

which is a classical document of the insular narrowness which continued to be one of the characteristics of static Anglicanism.

'I have spoken throughout of the foreign reformation as of a thing that has passed away. Lutheranism and Calvinism are indeed now little more than matters of history, for the feeble and lifeless relics which they have left behind, and which still bear their names, are but painful memorials of systems whose imperfections and faults, whatever they might be, were dignified by a holy ardour and zeal for God and for God's revelation. . . . Overrun by the audacious impiety of Neologism, an infidelity which clothes itself under the name of Christianity in order to inflict a more grievous wound on faith, or sunk into the deadly slumber of Socinian and Arian apostasy, Lutheranism and Calvinism, as religious systems, seem to have nearly perished in the countries where they arose.'[1]

However narrow and unhistorical this judgment is, especially for an age when the Neo-Lutheran orthodoxy was on the point of issuing out of partly the same roots which produced the Oxford Movement, yet it is comparatively more intelligible than that the ignoring of the fact of Lutheran and Reformed Protestantism on the part of static Anglicanism could continue, even after the Protestantism of North America came seriously into the horizon of Europe.

In spite of, perhaps partly because of this its narrowness and limitations, Palmer's book is a classic document for the study of the view of the Church with which we are now specially dealing[2]: the idea which proceeds from the authority

[1] *Op. cit.* vol. i. p. 388. The author excepts from his general judgment of Continental Protestantism 'the Swedish Lutheran Church, because it forms a peculiar case, and I have not yet examined completely the question of their orders and Reformation.'

[2] Here we must also recall how the static idea of the Church is mirrored in the collections of proof-passages from the primitive Church, which were now published. This applies partly to the series *Records of the Church*, published as a complement to *Tracts*, partly to the great undertaking, *Library of the Fathers*. In this connection must also be mentioned a work in three volumes, published in Cambridge, 1841–43: G. W. Harvey, *Ecclesiae Anglicanae vindex catholicus, sive articulorum Ecclesiae Anglicanae cum scriptis Ss. patrum nova collatio.* Of importance as witness of the actuality of the same ideas in circles other than Oxford is C. Wordsworth, *Theophilus Anglicanus, or Instruction for the Young Student concerning the Church and our own Branch of it* (London, 1843). This is a school text-book (in question and answer form) of static Anglicanism. It is a learned work, and, independently of the *Tracts*, it maintains the Apostolic Succession and the thought of the Anglican Church as a branch of the true Church.

for all times of the undivided Church and its oecumenical Councils, and which from this thinks it can derive infallible definitions of the nature of a true Church, and which therefore leads to the view of the Christian Church under the well-known picture of a tree with three branches—the Roman, the Eastern, and the Anglican—but proposes to ignore the existence of all other shoots, almost in mild surprise at the master of the garden's omission to purge away this vegetation so flatly contrary to programme. It is not here our task to enter into a very unnecessary discussion of the questions concerning this view, whether God's revelation to the world was definitely closed in the year 1054, or perhaps at a still earlier date. It only remains to establish the fact, that this idea of the Church in fact was little altered by the Oxford Movement. Palmer's book might just as well have been written before 1833. But what is new is the intense earnestness with which these principles are proclaimed, and this as well as the continuous emphasising of the points which were specially applied in the great defence of the Church (especially the succession), is the quite undeserved advantage which the static view has had from having been combined with a period of deep religious awakening. As soon as the newly roused religious sense got to work on the inherited thoughts of the Church, it tended to burst their narrow limits. But in spite of this innate dualism, the domination of staticism in the history of later Neo-Anglicanism is scarcely comprehensible, unless one bears in mind that it borrowed fire and intensity from a purely religious zeal.

In one point, however, the Oxford Movement effected a radical change in the old Anglican conception of the Church, with respect to its view of the problem of the State Church The essential factors which joined in bringing out this change have previously been explained; the ideas of Coleridge and Whately of the independence of the Church, and the political situation, which even in the lawful descendants of the Caroline Anglicanism evoked a Puritan spirit of revolt—though its weapons were derived from the armoury of the Cavaliers. 'Did the State make us? Can it unmake us?' asks Newman in Tract No. 2, pointing to the charter of the Apostolic commission. In few points did the new enthusiasm

for the Church as an independent Society of Divine origin show itself more positively fruitful than in this. In this respect there is an unmistakable likeness to an almost contemporary movement in the history of British Christianity, the secession of the Scottish Free Kirk.[1] From the days of the Oxford Movement the effort to maintain the freedom and right of self-determination of the Church did not cease. Its old provincial synods, the Convocations, were revived. In our own day, perhaps the most important step has been taken. There is no need of deep research to discover the seeds of this development already in the 'Tracts for the Times' and contemporary writings. No doubt in this case also traditionalism has the upper hand in Palmer[2]; no doubt Keble even after 'the national apostasy' in Old Testament language preaches about the duty of the King in caring for the Church as a holy λειτουργία.[3]

But Froude saw more clearly than others at an early date how the Liberal reforms of 1828 and 1829 removed

[1] For the question of the Oxford Movement and the problem of the State Church see a work by a pupil of the foremost political philosopher of Neo-Anglicanism, J. N. Figgis—H. J. Laski, *Studies in the Problem of Sovereignty* (Newhaven, 1917), ch. iii. 'The Political Theory of the Oxford Movement,' pp. 89, 112, 144: 'It was a definition of the Church that the Tractarians attempted, and they found almost immediately that to define its identity was to assert its exclusiveness.' The Liberal idea, 'that the ecclesiastical sovereign was the body of the faithful,' he derives from Marsiglio of Padua, while the Tractarians follow Thomas Aquinas.

[2] *Treatise of the Church*, vol. ii. p. 346: 'We may now see how reasonable and catholic was the oath of regal supremacy prescribed by the Parliament of Queen Elizabeth and still subscribed by the clergy of England'; and p. 352, on the nomination of Bishops: 'The Church has certainly very frequently consented that the prince should nominate bishops. . . . Nor perhaps would it be easy to find a more convenient system under existing circumstances.'

[3] J. Keble, *Sermons Academical and Occasional* (Oxford, 1847), pp. 148–172 ('Church and State'). As throwing light on Keble's position in the matter of the State Church see an essay in the *British Critic* for 1839, 'The State in its Relations with the Church' (reprinted in pamphlet form, with preface by Liddon; Oxford, 1896), giving a presentation of Gladstone's book with the same title. Here too there is a high conception of the State's religious duty towards the Church: the words of Isaiah about 'nursing fathers and nursing mothers' are 'equivalent to a whole code of Canon laws' (p. 24). But even more than such a 'national sin as to reject the Church must one avoid the Church itself being led by fear of public evil or any other cause, to forego any of her sacred principles for the sake of retaining her connection, real or nominal, with the State' (p. 534). Cp. also Keble's sermon 'On the Death of a King' (at William IV's death), 1837, in *Plain Sermons*, vol. iv. No. 101.

the very pillars of the English Church Constitution. It is of special interest to see how the situation of the time, in September 1833, rouses in this Cavalier of a later age a sincere admiration of the earliest Puritans: 'I have been reading a good deal lately about your friends the Puritans in Queen Elizabeth's time; and really I like poor Penry very much. I think of writing "An Apology for the early Puritans," whose case I think to be this. The Church of England had relinquished its claim to the *jus Divinum* and considered Ordination to emanate ultimately from the Queen. These poor fellows, *i.e.* Penry and Co., not Beza and Co., or Knox and Co., detested so abominable a notion: but what could they do? They had been bred up in a horror of trusting history in matters of religion, so they could look for a divine institution and a priesthood nowhere except in the Bible.'[1] His view of the situation is developed in a treatise of the same period, 'Remarks on State Interference in Matters Spiritual.'[2] The three great reforms, (1) abolition of the Test and Corporation Acts, (2) Catholic Emancipation, and (3) the reform of Parliament, have so altered the composition of Parliament, that this has lost its character as lay-synod for the Church of England. Therefore its occupation with the internal affairs of the Church can no longer be justified, but in its place a lay-synod for the Church must be created. Almost a century was to elapse before this consequence was drawn by the constitution of the National Assembly of the Church of England.[3] Another side, where Froude also characteristically anticipates the present demand for reform, is in his criticism of the interference of State and lawyers in the appointment to Church offices. The system of election of Bishops by virtue of the *congé d'élire* of the Prime Minister is explained

[1] Froude's *Remains*, vol. i. part 1, p. 327.

[2] Printed in *Remains*, vol. ii. part 1, pp. 184–269.

[3] Froude writes of the essay in question that it is his intention 'to have a touch at the King's supremacy, which I think Hooker would not justify under present circumstances.' It is also interesting to compare his plan of a lay-synod with the Church constitution of to-day: 'Its members should be elected by universal suffrage among the communicants, *more primitivo*' (*ibid.* vol. i. part 1, p. 328). A year later (November 20, 1834) he has in the meantime changed his opinion and is 'out of conceit with old Hooker's notion of a lay-synod: it is unecclesiastical and whig. We must only be popular in the choice of Church officers' (p. 333).

and unmercifully trounced.[1] He also attacks the application of patronage, and the laws which make it impossible for the Bishop to exclude an unfit person from a cure to which he has been presented by a patron, unless he can prove before an ordinary tribunal, that the man in question is guilty of heresy or gross immorality.[2] The depth of the problem is shown still more clearly, when Froude comes to the question of Church discipline (in 'Remarks on Church Discipline').[3] On this point historical orientation had to put in clear light the difference between the contemporary and the older Church, and not merely the undivided Church of the Fathers or that of the later Middle Age, with which Froude was most familiar, but also the old Anglican. Had not even Bishop Wilson taken seriously the Church's duty of excommunication?[4] Where could it more plainly be noted whether the salt had lost its savour? 'If a National Church means a Church without Church discipline, every argument for Church discipline is an argument against a National Church; and the best thing we can do is to unnationalise ours as soon as possible.'[5] 'The body of the English nation either are sincere Christians or they are not; if they are, they will submit to Discipline as readily as the primitive Christians did. If not,—let us tell the truth and shame the devil; let us give up a National Church and have a real one.'[6]

Thus the static view of the Church, even in its application to practical Church life, attempts to burst its bounds under the influence of a fiery spirit. Out of the contemplation of the unalterable past is begotten the motive force to the alteration of the present. Here, too, the judgment of the Catholic past is different from that of the Anglican past. The contrast between these two guiding stars in the matter certainly contributed in no small degree to weaken the connection between old and new Anglicanism in other points

[1] *Remains*, vol. ii. part 1, pp. 246–257.

[2] This is expressed in Froude, Tract No. 59, on *Church and State*.

[3] *Remains*, vol. ii. part 1, pp. 270–314.

[4] Tract No. 37, *Bishop Wilson's Form of Excommunication*.

[5] *Remains*, vol. ii. part 1, p. 272. For the Tractarian view of Church discipline and the duty of excommunication, cp. *Lyra Apostolica*, p. 163.

[6] *Remains*, vol. ii. part 1, p. 274. This question was also raised by Froude at the Hadleigh meeting.

and make the latter more accessible to seductive strains from without. It is anyhow plain, that from the first years of the Oxford Movement there runs through the history of Neo-Anglicanism a vein of increasing aversion to the thought of a State Church, and that there already appears the demand for the independence of the Church, which has now been echoed in the widest circles.

Though the Tractarian picture of the Church in its essentials is the same as that of the old High Churchmanship, corrected as we have seen in some points by reference to the external demands of the age, yet the frame of the picture and even the light, which makes some features appear more clearly than others, is largely that of the Romantic age. This applies not only to the revived historical sense generally. It is the spirit of romance which lives in Froude's studies of Thomas Becket, just as in Scott's novels; we find it in his explanation of the theory of the Gothic arch[1]: it meets us in the illustrations of the *British Magazine*; and when other interests began to come to the front in Oxford, it found a new home in Cambridge. Here historical studies and interest in Church affairs were combined in the founders of the Camden Society (1838): here the learned humanist, J. M. Neale, was trained for his lifelong work of recovering for his own age the best of the treasury of song in the Church of the past. All this was crystallised in pre-Raphaelite art. The 'apostolic' poetry proclaims its origin, not merely by tone and choice of subject, but also by preference for a certain twilight of expression, which was already a distinguishing feature of 'The Christian Year.' In the chief book of poetry which the movement produced, 'Lyra Apostolica,' the twilight is illuminated by the lightning of sword-strokes, when Newman's combative temper forges poetry into a weapon against the idols of the day; and even Keble learned to sound the last trumpet instead of the shepherd's pipe. But even while Newman is raising up the portrait of Athanasius to condemn his own generation,[2] Isaac Williams is following with trembling step the path of Origen:

[1] 'Church Architecture,' *Remains*, vol. ii. part 1, pp. 338–374; cp. 'Farewell to Feudalism' in *Lyra Apostolica*, No. 159.

[2] *Lyra*, No. 94.

Into God's Word, as in a palace fair,
Thou leadest on and on, while still beyond
Each chamber, touched by holy wisdom's wand,
Another opes, more beautiful and rare [1];

or forms round the portrait of St. Basil a cabinet piece of romantic poetry:

Beautiful flowers round Wisdom's secret well,
Deep holy thoughts of penitential lore,
But dressed with images from Nature's store,
Handmaid of piety. Like thine own cell
By Pontic mountain wilds and shaggy fell,
Great Basil! there within thy lonely door,
Watching, and Fast, and Prayer, and Penance dwell,
And sternly nursed Affections heavenward soar.
Without are setting suns and summer skies,
Ravine, rock, wood, and fountain melodies;
And Earth and Heaven, holding communion sweet,
Teem with wild beauty. Such thy calm retreat,
Blest Saint! and of thyself an emblem meet,
All fair without, within all stern and wise.[2]

Perhaps a longer life would have been granted to Isaac Williams' compcsitions if he had confined himself to cultivating the vein of true romantic poetry, which doubtless was in him, though its stream was thin, instead of attempting to embrace the whole apostolic doctrine in a comprehensive poetic work. Certainly they are not without their charm, these thick books of verse with their monastic detailed work; for instance, the thorough-going allegorising of 'The Cathedral'[3] with its tone of naive and humble piety, akin to the old

[1] *Lyra*, No. 93. [2] *Ibid.* No. 96; also in *The Cathedral.*

[3] This is the most complete attempt to give in poetic form a rendering of the static Anglican system with romantic colouring. Through the Cathedral's three west portals, penitence, faith, and obedience (in the centre, with a special warning against entrance on the part of those 'whose cry is liberty'), one enters the nave, Scripture, with Faith and Prayer as side-aisles; the pillars in the nave are the prophets and patriarchs; in the side chapel rest the churchman's friends, a Ken and an Andrewes; from the cloisters at the side, occupied by a series of Ecclesiastical Sonnets, the passage 'sacred retirement' leads to the 'chapter-house' Episcopacy; the steps to the choir are the Litany; the choir-screen is Williams' favourite doctrine of the *disciplina arcani*; the choir is filled by the 'sacramental hymn'; its pillars are the Apostles, in the windows are pictures of the early Fathers, in the East Window is the Crucifixion.

engravings, to which he attaches his poetry in ' The Baptistery.' Likeness to ' The Christian Year ' is more apparent in the smaller poems, which are collected, *e.g.*, in ' Thoughts in Past Years ' (1838), where among much uninspired declamation in verse,[1] a pearl or two glitter with genuine if somewhat dim radiance.[2]

This on the whole very unprofitable poetry has its historical interest, because it helps us to understand the actual nature of the appeal to the past of the Oxford school. The romantic view of history softens and colours the hard outlines of the static conception of the Church. One who regards its dissected skeleton in the more unmerciful light of a later age, becomes perhaps on that account somewhat unjust in his judgment of these prophets of Church ideals in the first half of the nineteenth century. It is to the idealised past of romanticism, a past which appears to the fancy as a harmonious unity, an *aurea aetas*, whose rise, course, and transition to the next ages no importunate critical enquiry had as yet investigated. What is only partly known allures with the fascination of great possibilities and endless mystery—it is probably thus that we have to explain the attractive power the proof of probability had for the Oxford school. When the bright world of eternal reality has once opened its gate into the darkness of temporal illusionary life, it is a question of anxiously overhauling the whole neighbourhood in which broken reflections may have remained hidden. Thus Keble can sing to the lamp in his study :

[1] In the series, *The Country Pastor*, are no less than five sonnets dedicated to the subject ' Neglect of Fast-Days ' ; a sixth follows containing ' The Irresolute Churchman's Answer ' : it is the divided mind of Liberalism, which must compromise with the age and seek to wrestle with it in order to get its blessing in place of God's—' O Time, I seize thee by thy wings, and wrestle with thee, bless me ere we part.'

[2] So especially when he is inspired by the thought of the endless mystery of existence—*e.g.* in ' Evening ' (No. 55 in the series *The Golden Valley*), ' A Summer Night ' (in *The Sacred City*, p. 337), or ' In the Midst of Life we are in Death ' (*ibid.* p. 289). Of Williams' other works we may mention *The Altar, or Meditations in Verse on the Great Christian Sacrifice* (London, 1874), and perhaps most forgotten of all, but peculiarly touching, *The Christian Scholar* (Oxford, 1849), dedicated to Keble, ' haec cum sua sint verius quam mea,' which aims at putting the classics to the service of a higher wisdom by Christian adaptations of Greek and Latin authors. The versification of *Hymns on the Catechism* (London, 1843) is comparatively unimportant.

Come, twinkle in my lonely room,
Companion true in hours of gloom ;
Come, light me on a little space,
The heavenly vision to retrace.[1]

But the past has its peculiar fascination also just as past. The mysterious mirror of memory gilds everything that seems common when present. Newman, usually perhaps less romantic than his companions, once showed a masterly realisation of this experience in his sermon 'Christ manifested in Remembrance.'[2] We only see afterwards how near God has been to us: 'What is dark while it is meeting us, reflects the Sun of Righteousness, when it is past. . . . And hence perchance it is, that years that are past bear in retrospect so much of fragrance with them, though at the time perhaps we saw little in them to take pleasure in ; or rather we did not, could not realise that we *were* receiving pleasure, though we received it. We received pleasure, because we were in the presence of God, but we knew it not. . . . Such, I say, is the sweetness and softness with which days long passed away fall upon the memory and strike us. The most ordinary years, when we seemed to be living for nothing, these shine forth to us in their very regularity and orderly course.' So may even sorrowful times to the memory be full of light, so childhood's years have their special brightness,[3] in both cases through

[1] 'Light in the Closet—The Churchman to his Lamp,' No. 64 in *Lyra Apostolica*. By the light of the lamp he goes

'Our fathers' armoury to explore,
And sort and number wistfully
A few bright weapons . . . '

[2] *Parochial and Plain Sermons*, vol. iv. No. 17, p. 261.

[3] 'Such are the feelings with which men often look on their childhood, when any accident brings it vividly before them. Some relic or token of that early time, some spot, or some book, or a word, or a scent, or a sound, brings them back in memory to the first years of their discipleship, and they then see, what they could not know at the time, that God's presence went up with them and gave them rest. . . . They think it is those very years which they yearn after, whereas it is the presence of God which, as they now see, was then over them, which attracts them. They think that they regret the past, when they are but longing after the future. It is not that they would be children again, but that they would be Angels and see God ; they would be immortal beings, crowned with amaranth, robed in white, and with palms in their hands, before His Throne' (*ibid.* p. 263).

God's presence. And what happens to the individual, happens also to the Church. In memory we see its great ages, as we see God near. 'Great Saints, great events, great privileges, like the everlasting mountains, grow as we recede from them.'

Yet the magic of the past did not succeed in holding Newman captive. When, in the great crisis of his life, he thought he was only more clearly understanding its content and following its lead, in effect he shook off its fetters. His poem on God's hidden Saints, 'The True Elect' in 'Lyra Apostolica' (No. 55), contains a verse which strikingly contrasts with the feeling in Keble's poem on 'The Churchman's Lamp,' whose light could only help to explore the past :

> They gleam amid the night,
> Chill sluggish mists stifling the heavenly ray :
> Fame chants the while,—old history trims his light,
> Aping the day ;
> In vain ! staid look, loud voice, and reason's might
> Forcing its learned way,
> Blind characters ! these aid us not to trace
> Christ and His princely race.

So there was not wanting in the poetry under romantic influence witness to the peculiar elasticity of religion, which in the end was to burst the fetters of staticism.

## CHAPTER XII

### THE FUNDAMENTAL FORMS OF TRACTARIAN PIETY

If the Oxford Movement had only been a reaction against the wave of political and philosophic Liberalism, a reversion to the ideals of the past, its historical importance would have been inexplicable. There may be some truth in the statement that the historian of our day, when he looks back to the movement, is not able to put it in the main line of theological progress.[1] But in that case it is not the first time, that what is a reaction in the view of the technical theologian, has gone hand in hand with a deepening and swelling up of intensely religious life. It is part of the peculiar tragedy of Church history that the overwhelming feeling of the one thing necessary, the salvation of the soul, finds it difficult to recognise the demand for truth as an equally justified aspect of revelation. Certainly it is only as a movement, first and foremost religious and most deeply religious, that the Oxford Movement can be understood.[2] It was a religious revival, in so far akin to the Evangelical Movement, in a manner a continuation and reshaping of it. In some points the connection with it seems to be clear, in others it is made probable by the personal history of the leading men. It is as a purely religious movement that Neo-Anglicanism became the foremost active factor in the modern Church life of England.

An analysis of the type of piety which grew up in Oxford in the thirties must essentially be an analysis of Newman's preaching from the pulpit of St. Mary-the-Virgin. These sermons not merely, in so far as they appear in the series 'Parochial and Plain Sermons,' give the most intense and

[1] Storr, *The Development of English Theology*, p. 3.
[2] Cp. H. Rashdall, *Christus in Ecclesia* (Edinburgh, 1904), p. 3.

rich shades of expression of the peculiar character of Tractarian piety; they in no small measure created and shaped it. It is superfluous here to do more than mention how these sermons, a literary master-work belonging to the best productions of English prose, under the calm surface and reserved delivery burning with the fire of religious genius, from 1828 captivated the best, if not the majority, of the rising generation,[1] even many who remained alien to the Church programme of the Oxford school.[2] Though these sermons, therefore, must be the chief source of our investigation, they are supplemented by other documents which, both by their agreements and their differences, make it possible to arrive at the common spiritual atmosphere, the fundamental forms of Tractarian piety, and not merely that of Newman.

A prominent place among the documents is of course taken by the sermons and personal diaries of H. Froude, as collected in his 'Remains.' Pusey's sermons of the period in question,[3] not apparently very numerous, are in some points very illuminating, less perhaps so the relevant parts of Keble's preaching.[4] A more comprehensive than productive material for exhibiting in the first instance the religious feeling of the more conservative group, though both Pusey and Newman contributed, is contained in the collection 'Plain Sermons, by

[1] Ward, *Life of Newman*, vol. i. p. 64; Church, *The Oxford Movement*, p. 113; J. A. Froude, *Short Studies*, vol. v. p. 206; and *Nemesis of Faith* (London, 1849), p. 144.

[2] Cp. an interesting testimony amongst many to the attractiveness which the sermons in St. Mary's had upon a man who continued faithful to Evangelicalism, T. D. Bernard, *Autobiographical Notes, a Fragment* (privately printed 1909): 'In the pulpit the spare figure in a black gown reading from a manuscript without gesture or movement seemed studiously divested of all accessory means of impression. . . . The power of the preacher lay in the pure English of the lucid sentences, which gave stimulus to thought, suggested considerations which had not been familiar, and from time to time seemed to open a larger and more distant horizon. Above all there was a sense of reality unusually distinct—reality in regard to things divine, in the reverential apprehension of their certainty and their nearness, and reality in regard to things human'

[3] Besides individual sermons, of which a list is given by the editors of the fourth volume of Liddon's *Life of Pusey*, we may here quote the first published collection of sermons, *Sermons during the Season from Advent to Whitsuntide* (Oxford, 1848), reprinted as the first part of *Parochial Sermons*.

[4] *Sermons Academical and Occasional* (Oxford, 1847; 2nd ed., 1848) contain some published earlier. The great posthumous collection, *Sermons for the Christian Year* (in 12 vols., London, 1884), contains some dated before 1845.

Contributors to the "Tracts for the Times,"' which Isaac Williams began to publish in 1839 with the definite intention of opposing the radicalising of the movement, and completed in ten volumes down to 1848.[1] But the object of the publication must have, to some extent, altered the tone of the voices heard in it.

We find in sharper definition the practical religious principles of the movement in a series of sermons of 1845, which may be said to mark the close of the Tractarian phase of the Neo-Anglican Movement: 'A Course of Sermons, chiefly bearing on Repentance and Amendment of Life' (preached in St. Saviour's, Leeds, during the week after its consecration on the Feast of St. Simon and St. Jude 1845), Oxford, 1845. St. Saviour's, Leeds, was in the next generation to show one of the most important attempts to reproduce the thoughts of the Oxford school in practical Church life. It had been largely built out of Pusey's private means, and in the series of sermons which followed its consecration his voice was foremost. Marriott, Keble, Williams, and others also contributed. Newman had then already gone over. Kindred thoughts occur also in Manning's Anglican sermons,[2] which, however, as falling outside the Oxford Movement proper, are only in individual cases quoted. It must also be mentioned that some of the Tracts are directly applicable to the characterisation of piety, as well as the poetical productions of their writers.

[1] Cp. *The Autobiography of Isaac Williams* (ed. by Prevost, London, 1892), p. 98. These sermons were anonymously published; but at the end of the tenth volume it is stated which had the same authors, the authors being denoted by the letters A to G. Pusey's own copy of *Plain Sermons* is in the library of Pusey House, Oxford. In this Pusey, in his own handwriting, set down some of the authors' initials. A = J. K. (John Keble); B = I. W. (Isaac Williams); E = T. K. (Thomas Keble); against F no initial is placed, and G is explained by the letter W. According to a list given in a letter to the *Guardian* of January 14, 1891, by the Rev. Sir William Cope, Bart., and communicated to me by the kindness of Canon Ollard and Dr. Darwell Stone, W means Rev. R. F. Wilson, vicar of Rownham. This list also identifies F with Sir George Prevost. Pusey also denoted by H (explained by the initial W, subsequently altered to G) the author of Sermons 221–226, thus correcting the printed ascription to J. Keble. According to a letter of the Rev. B. S. Hack, C denotes Pusey, who wrote the whole of vol. iii.; D, Newman, the whole of vol. v. (these sermons are also found in vols. vii. and viii. of *Parochial and Plain Sermons*).

[2] H. E. Manning, *Sermons*, vols. i.–iv. (1st ed. of vol. i., London, 1842).

Like all deeply religious utterances, the preaching of Newman and his friends is largely confined to the region which is the common spiritual home of all Christians; and the parts in which we find a definite and peculiar type of thinking are subordinate in comparison with this *commune Christianorum*. Though a historical analysis must chiefly deal with the distinctively characteristic parts, if it is to perform its functions, it must not neglect to point in the first instance to the central Christian preaching; and this when subjected to a close examination may, by the stronger emphasis laid on certain points, prove as important for the characterisation of the whole as the peculiar features.

Most witnesses agree in regarding the power of realising the inevitable actuality of the spiritual world as the most prominent feature in Newman's sermons. This was partly due, no doubt, to his personal equipment. It is the poet and the literary artist, as much as the preacher, that we find in a description like this: 'To those who live by faith, every thing they see speaks of that future world; the very glories of nature, the sun, moon, and stars, and the richness and the beauty of the earth are as types and figures, witnessing and teaching the invisible things of God. All that we see is destined one day to burst forth into a heavenly bloom, and to be transfigured into immortal glory. Heaven at present is out of sight, but in due time, as snow melts and discovers what it lay upon, so will this visible creation fade away before those greater splendours which are behind it, and on which at present it depends. In that day shadows will retire, and the substance show itself. The sun will grow pale and be lost in the sky, but it will be before the radiance of Him whom it does but image, the Sun of Righteousness, with healing on His wings, who will come forth in visible form, as a bridegroom out of his chamber, while His perishable type decays. The stars which surround it will be replaced by Saints and Angels circling His Throne. Above and below, the clouds of the air, the trees of the field, the waters of the great deep, will be found impregnated with the forms of everlasting spirits, the servants of God which do His pleasure. And our own mortal bodies will then be found in like manner to contain within them an inner man, which will then receive its due

proportions, as the soul's harmonious organ, instead of that gross mass of flesh and blood which sight and touch are sensible of. For this glorious manifestation the whole creation is at present in travail earnestly desiring that it may be accomplished in its season.'[1]

This peculiar strength in his grasp of the invisible world, before the reality of which the visible disappears, is thus a distinguishing mark of Newman's personal religion. The earth and its beauty are only an earnest of a world beyond. 'Even when it is gayest, with all its blossom on, and shows most touchingly what lies hid in it, yet it is not enough. We know much more lies hid in it than what we see. A world of Saints and Angels, a glorious world, the palace of God, the mountain of the Lord of Hosts, the Heavenly Jerusalem, the throne of God and Christ, all these wonders . . . lie hid in what we see. . . . We know that what we see is as a screen, hiding from us God and Christ, and His Saints and Angels. And we earnestly desire and pray for the dissolution of all that we see, from our longing after that which we do not see. . . .'[2]

But with these features, which at least in their sharply marked form, are in the first instance peculiar to Newman, are closely united others, which are more common to the whole movement, and partly akin to some features of the static conception of the Church, when it is viewed in the light of the romantic age. This applies especially to the mysterious character of spiritual reality. All our thoughts and concepts are only symbols, approximate expressions of a truth and a reality which go beyond the possibilities of thought and speech. Before this reality, the mightiness of which is beyond all imagination, man must tremble. When the revealed word and the pronouncements of science are in conflict, we have not to make helpless attempts to harmonise the two, but we have

[1] *Parochial and Plain Sermons* ('The Greatness and Littleness of Human Life'), vol. iv. No. 14, p. 233; cp. p. 209, where the subject is the natural spring as the figure of the spiritual: 'This earth, which now buds forth in leaves and blossoms, will one day burst forth into a new world of light and glory, in which we shall see Saints and Angels dwelling.' On the thought of Nature as an instrument for the revelation of the spiritual, Newman dwells, as typical of the conception of Nature in *The Christian Year* (*Apologia*, p. 77; ed. 1908, p. 18).

[2] *Parochial and Plain Sermons* ('The Invisible World'), vol. iv. No. 13, p. 210.

only to bow before the thought, that what is presented to us in the realm of Nature, or in that of grace, though true in so complete a sense, that we do not venture to take anything from it, yet is only an indication, useful for action, useful in its place, 'till the day break and the shadows flee away, useful in such a way, that both the one and the other representation may at once be used, as two languages, as two separate approximations towards the Awful Unknown Truth, such as will not mislead us in their respective provinces.' [1]

The invisible world to Tractarian piety is above all *mysterious* and *awful:* these two words contain the very fundamental note of its feeling, a feeling of wonder and holy awe. *Awfulness* will meet us at every step in our exposition, almost in every important document.[2] To the Oxford men, more than to the majority of modern types of piety, the realities of religion form a *mysterium tremendum.* How could they do anything but tremble? Was not every step in life for the Christian full of dreadful mysterious seriousness? What is more dreadful than to have an immortal soul, a soul which never dies, never ceases to think and be conscious, capable of bliss and misery? [3] 'To be a Christian is one of

[1] *Parochial and Plain Sermons* ('Mysteries in Religion'), vol. ii. No. 18, p. 209; cp. p. 211: 'And since we do not know, we will studiously keep to the figure given us in Scripture. . . . We will hold it as a Mystery or (what was anciently called) a Truth Sacramental; that is a high invisible grace lodged in an outward form, a precious possession, to be piously and thankfully guarded for the sake of the heavenly reality contained in it.'

[2] According to Froude's view (reproduced in the Preface to the second part of *Remains*) the Reformers must not be imitated 'in their practical handling of the unspeakably awful matters with which they were concerned' (*ibid.* vol. ii. No. 1, p. xix); cp. Pusey, *Sermons during the Season from Advent to Whitsuntide*, pp. 39, 79, 81, and many other passages.

[3] 'To discern our immortality is necessarily connected with fear and trembling and repentance, in the case of every Christian' (*Parochial and Plain Sermons* ('The Immortality of the Soul'), vol. i. No. 2, p. 17). The same sermon gives a very typical expression of Newman's view of the sovereign life of the soul. 'To understand that we have souls, is to feel our separation from things visible, our independence of them, our distinct existence in ourselves, our individuality. . . . And should it so happen that misfortunes come upon us . . . then still more we are led to understand the nothingness of this world: then still more are we led to distrust it, and are weaned from the love of it, till at length it floats before our eyes merely as some idle veil, which, notwithstanding its many tints, cannot hide the view of what is beyond it; and we begin by degrees to perceive that there are but two beings in the whole universe—our Soul, and the God who made it' (p. 19); cp. *Apologia*, p. 59 (ed. 1908, p. 4).

the most wondrous and awful gifts in the world. It is, in one sense, to be higher than Angel or Archangel. If we have any portion of an enlightened faith, we shall understand that our state, as members of Christ's Church, is full of mystery. What is so mysterious as to be born, as we are, under God's wrath? What so mysterious as to be redeemed by the death of the Son of God made flesh? What so mysterious as to receive the virtue of that Death, one by one, through Sacraments?'[1]

Even though eschatological chords at times chime in, this feeling of holy awe in Newman has little in common with mere terror of the possibility of eternal damnation. It is incorrect, when this has been made into the predominant motive of his religious life.[2] The feeling of dread and the painting of terrors of the Last Judgment have a far more central place in Pusey's preaching than in Newman's.[3] The Tractarian feeling of *awfulness* is not a consequence of dread of judgment, but of a lively sense of the nearness and majesty of God, and to it must be assigned a high religious quality.

Here, also, the thought of the necessity of taking exact care of all probable truth gets its religious accentuation. Since the mystery of the invisible world is so much greater than all its temporal expression, must not the risk of believing too little be much nearer to hand than the risk of believing too much? 'It is our duty to search diligently after every jot and tittle of the Truth graciously revealed to us, and to maintain it.'[4] In a sermon for St. Thomas's Day, there are represented to us 'two opposite characters of mind, the one credulous (as it

[1] *Parochial and Plain Sermons* ('Infant Baptism'), vol. iii. No. 20, p. 298.

[2] Bremond declares himself obliged, after a thorough study of Newman's sermons, to reject 'la terreur' as the chief motive force in his religion (*Newman*, pp. 254, 265, 270).

[3] Pusey, *op. cit.* p. 8 (in a sermon on 'The End of all Things'): 'And now amid this universal burning, and this awful lurid light of a world in flames, crackling, sinking, melting, amid the deluge of the everlasting fire of God . . .'; cp. also Keble's sermons, 'The Last Judgment' and 'Hell,' in *A Course of Sermons preached in St. Saviour's Church, Leeds.* Somewhat surprising is Oakeley's expression about Froude (*Historical Notes on the Tractarian Movement* (London, 1865), p. 32) that he was unlike the other Tractarians by 'an extraordinary leaning to the side of religious dread and a corresponding suppression of the sentiments of love and joy.'

[4] *Parochial and Plain Sermons* ('The Gospel Witnesses'), vol. ii. No. 17, p. 203; cp. vol. iv. p. 228.

would be commonly called), the other candid, well-judging, and sagacious; and it is clear that the former of the two is the religious type rather than the latter.'[1] It is a holy and precious inheritance we are appointed to guard and to hand on to coming generations—'the ancient Truth once delivered to the Saints.' We do not know where the boundary line runs between necessary and other doctrines. 'Certainly we are bound to guard what may be essential as carefully as if we knew it was so.' And in doing so anxiety and watchfulness are becoming. For the earthly battle is fought out before a host of invisible witnesses. The dead are alive and watch over the living—if we forget this, we run the risk of 'losing reverence for Antiquity.'

'What shall sustain our faith (under God's grace) when we try to adhere to the Ancient Truth and seem solitary? What shall nerve the "watchman on the walls of Jerusalem," against the scorn and jealousy of the world, the charge of singularity, of fancifulness, of extravagance, of rashness? What shall keep us calm and peaceful within, when accused of "troubling Israel" and "prophesying evil"? What but the vision of all Saints of all ages, whose steps we follow? What but the image of Christ mystical stamped upon our hearts and memories? . . . We are not solitary . . . those multitudes in the primitive time, who believed, and taught, and worshipped, as we do, still live unto God, and . . . cry from the Altar.'[2]

This reverence for antiquity, deepened and strengthened by religion, combines with the conservative dogmatism

[1] *Parochial and Plain Sermons* ('Faith without Sight'), vol. ii. No. 2, p. 20. With this is combined the thought of action as the criterion of Faith: 'As Faith is content with but little light to begin its journey by, and makes it much by acting upon it, so also it reads, as it were by twilight, the message of Truth into its various details' (p. 23).

[2] *Ibid.* ('The Intermediate State') vol. iii. No. 25, p. 385; cp. *ibid.* ('Warfare the Condition of Victory') vol. vi. No. 16, p. 231: 'Such is our state;—Angels are looking on;—Christ has gone before,—Christ has given us an example, that we may follow His steps. He went through far more, infinitely more, that we can be called to suffer. Our brethren have gone through much more; and they seem to encourage us by their success, and to sympathise in our essay. Now it is our turn; and all ministering spirits keep silence and look on. O let not your foot slip, or your eye be false, or your ear dull, or your attention flagging!' The sermon ends with a picture of the eternal rest which awaits us, partly in images from the Apocalypse.

which Newman imbibed with the Calvinistic impressions of his youth, and which also formed a part of the High Church Tradition, to give the dogma of primitive antiquity a dominant position in the Tractarian preaching. It is also promoted by the romantic atmosphere, which welcomes the mysterious for its own sake, and by the theory of religious knowledge, which was being shaped in Newman's mind, and made him inclined to embrace with joy every paradox as an expression of the sovereignty of faith.

Trinity follows on Whitsuntide, according to a sermon as early as 1829, ' to warn us, that the enlightening vouchsafed to us is not an understanding of " all mysteries and all knowledge,"[1] but that love of charity which is " the fulfilling of the Law," that religious light is intellectual darkness.'[2] But the mysterious character of revelation consists not in inner contradiction, but in the fact that religious reality can only partially be comprehended by human reason Therefore the ' mysteriousness ' of doctrine has a special importance as a touchstone to distinguish the hypocritical from the sincere disciple. Here it is a case of *credere ut intelligas :* ' Faith only can introduce us to the unseen Presence of God ; let us venture to believe, let us make trial before we see, and the evidence which others demand before believing we shall gain more abundantly by believing.'[3]

This way of looking at things has its first application to the doctrine of the Trinity. That this is mysterious is no objection to it, but rather the opposite. ' It would be strange indeed . . . if any doctrine concerning God's infinite and eternal Nature were not mysterious.'[4] Such an idea cannot, of course, shrink from preaching the dogma with all the apparatus of ancient schclasticism.[5] But in Newman's preaching even the deepest speculation of old times on the eternal self-sufficient Being of the Three in One can

[1] *Parochial and Plain Sermons* (' The Christian Mysteries '), vol. i. No. 16, p. 204.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 211.

[3] *Ibid.* (' The Gospel Sign addressed to Faith ') vol. vi. p. 114 ; cp. the famous sermon on ' Ventures of Faith ' (vol. iv. p. 20).

[4] *Ibid.* (' Faith without Demonstration ') vol. vi. No. 23, p. 333 ; cp. ' I consider that this mysteriousness is, as far as it proves anything, a recommendation of the doctrine.'

[5] *Ibid.* (' The Mystery of the Holy Trinity ') vol. vi. No. 24.

give wings to word and thought and make the dogma living as it seldom has been in modern times :

'Thus was it, we are told, from everlasting ; before the heavens and the earth were made, before man fell or Angels rebelled, before the sons of God were formed in the morning of creation, yea, before there were Seraphim to veil their faces before Him and cry "Holy," He existed, without ministers, without attendants, without court and kingdom, without manifested glory, without anything but Himself ; He, His own Temple ; His own infinite rest ; His own supreme bliss, from eternity. . . . Wonderful and strange to creatures who grovel on this earth as we, that He, the All-Powerful, the All-Wise, the All-Good, the All-Glorious, should for an eternity, for years without end, or rather apart from time, which is but one of His Creatures, should have dwelt without those through whom He might be powerful, in whom He might be wise, towards whom He might be good, by whom He might be glorified. . . . He, the All-powerful God, rested from eternity, and did not work ; and yet, why *not* rest, wonderful though it be, seeing He was so blessed in Himself? Why should *He* seek external objects to know, to love, and to commune with, who was All-sufficient in Himself? How could He need fellows, as though He were a man, when He was not solitary, but had ever with Him His Only-Begotten Word in whom He delighted, whom He loved ineffably, and the Eternal Spirit, the very bond of love and peace, dwelling in, and dwelt in by Father and Son? Rather how was it that He ever began to create, who had a Son without beginning and without imperfection, whom He could love with a perfect love? What exceeding exuberance of goodness was it that *He* should deign at length to surround Himself with creation, who had need of nothing, and to change His everlasting silence for the course of Providence and the conflict of good and evil?'[1]

Still more striking becomes the power of realizing the paradoxical in the matter of the doctrine of the Incarnation. Partly this was nearer the very centre of the life of piety —we shall see in a different context how it is out of this that the deepest spring of faith flowed for the men whose

[1] *Parochial and Plain Sermons* ('Peace in Believing'), vol. vi. No. 25, p. 364.

souls we are examining—partly the very theme was more inviting than others for an artistic representation, which had its strength in combining and contrasting invisible realities with the concrete experiences of life. Here mystery comes nearer, becomes more real than in any other point: 'No earthly images can come up to the awful and gracious truth, that God became the Son of Man—that the Word became Flesh, and was born of a woman. This ineffable mystery surpasses human words. No titles of earth can Christ give to Himself, ever so lowly or mean, which will fitly show us His condescension. His act and deed is too great even for His own lips to utter it.'[1] Here it is a question of the highest mysteries of the faith, here if anywhere it is a question of approaching the ineffable with trembling and reverence. For here are no mere phrases or doctrines mechanically received; it is a living and awful reality, that God became man. His divinity knows of no limitations, even in humiliation He is Himself the eternal and almighty: 'All the while He was on earth, when He was conceived, when He was born, when He was tempted, on the cross, in the grave, and now at God's right Hand—all the time through, He was the Eternal and Unchangeable Word, the Son of God.'[2] Perhaps even more strongly and more genuinely, it may be more unmercifully, it is expressed in Pusey's heavier style: 'Awful words to use; "God became," as though the Unchangeable could change. . . . He was strengthened, as Man, by the Angel whom, as God, He created. . . .[3] He was born of the Mother whom He had created for Himself; He was borne on the hands which He had formed; He received infantine nourishment at her breasts, which He filled.'[4]

We have an interesting witness of how Newman succeeded in placing this idea in all its paradoxical strength before his hearers in a sermon on the Passion. Even the reader

[1] *Parochial and Plain Sermons*, vol. viii. No. 16, p. 233.

[2] *Ibid.* ('The Humiliation of the Eternal Son'), vol. iii. No. 12, p. 164.

[3] *Sermons during the Season from Advent to Whitsuntide*, p. 62 (a Christmas sermon on 'The Incarnation, a Lesson of Humility,' which is dominated by the Augustinian idea of *Christus humilis*).

[4] *Ibid.* p. 66. The last thought comes from an interpretation of a psalm, 'as Scripture says'—with allusion to Ps. xxii. 9, 'Thou wast my hope when I hanged yet upon my mother's breasts.'

of the sermon, 'The Incarnate Son, a Sufferer and a Sacrifice,' must feel its force. Think of the officer who struck Jesus, when He stood before the High Priest. 'The words must be said, though I hardly dare say them—that officer lifted up his hand against God, the Son. This is not a figurative way of speaking, or a rhetorical form of words, or a harsh, extreme, and unadvisable statement; it is a literal and simple truth, it is a great Catholic doctrine.' He continues a brief recital of the story of the Passion. Jesus is mocked, maltreated, clad in purple robe, crowned with thorns, crucified—'Now I bid you consider that that Face, so ruthlessly smitten, was the Face of God Himself; the Brows bloody with the thorns, the Sacred Body exposed to view and lacerated with the scourge, the Hands nailed to the Cross, and, afterwards, the Side pierced with the spear; it was the Blood, and the Sacred Flesh, and the Hands, and the Temples, and the Side, and the Feet of God Himself, which the frenzied multitude then gazed upon. This is so fearful a thought, that when the mind first masters it, surely it will be difficult to think of anything else; so that, while we think of it, we must pray to God to temper it to us, and to give us strength to think of it lightly, lest it be too much for us.'[1]

But only in union with an equally complete assertion of Christ's human nature can the doctrine of His Divinity get its full religious value; in this respect the agreement between the primitive witness and that of experience was unambiguous. There is not space here to show how Tractarian piety, like that of Greek antiquity, culminates in the contemplation of the hypostatic union of man and God according to the pattern of the Christology of two natures, but without forgetting what it learned from the teaching of St. Augustine. But in this context it must be pointed out how the central thought of modern Anglican theology and piety—that in Christ the human

[1] *Parochial and Plain Sermons*, vol. vi. No. 6, p. 73. Doubtless this is the sermon to which J. A. Froude refers in *Short Studies*, vol. iv. p. 286. Newman had described in detail some of the incidents of Our Lord's Passion: 'He then paused. For a few moments there was a breathless silence. Then in a low, clear voice, of which the faintest vibration was audible in the furthest corner of St. Mary's, he said, "Now I bid you recollect, that He to whom these things were done was Almighty God." It was as if an electric shock had gone through the church, as if every person present understood for the first time the meaning of what he had all his life been repeating.'

nature was taken up into the Divine,[1] following the well-known expression of the Athanasian Creed, ' taking of the manhood into God ' (' assumptione humanitatis in Deum ')—required the assertion of the complete manhood in the nineteenth as much as in the fifth century, and how this requirement makes itself plainly noticeable.[2] But on the other hand it seems as if zeal for maintaining the complete Divinity in Newman and Pusey, as well as in Apollinaris of Laodicea and his school, at times so got the upper hand, that the human nature becomes little more than a veil and an actor's mask, as if they had not fully succeeded in maintaining their balance on the razor-edge of the orthodox doctrine of the two natures. When Pusey says that ' the Omniscient deigned, as Man, *to seem* to receive and put forth increase of knowledge,' [3] one must ask oneself if there is not here concealed a kind of refined Docetism. It is also impossible for Newman fully to realise the Temptation of Jesus : He was tempted ' by what was good in the world's offers, though unreasonable and unsuitable, and not by what was evil in them.' [4] He finds it difficult to account for the tears at Lazarus' grave.[5] No doubt after the incarnation human feelings, joy and sorrow, fear and anger, became His in as full a measure as other men's.[6] No doubt it is expressly said that ' the manhood which He assumed was not kept at a distance from Him (if I may so speak) as a mere instrument, or put on as a mere garment, or entered as a mere tabernacle, but it was really taken into the closest and most ineffable union with Him. He received it into His Divine Essence (if we may dare so to speak) almost as a new attribute of His Person.' [7] But even in the last expression the equipoise of the natures seems in danger of being abolished. In his

[1] Pusey, *op. cit.* p. 63 : ' If He have so taken our poor nature into Himself, that in Him it is In-Godded, Deitate ' (*deitate* by analogy with *incarnate*) ; cp. Newman, *ibid.* vol. vi. p. 62.

[2] See, *e.g.*, Newman, *op. cit.* vol. vi. p. 79 : ' We believe then, that when Christ suffered on the Cross, our Nature suffered in Him.'

[3] Pusey, *ibid.* p. 50.

[4] Newman, *ibid.* (' Christian Sympathy ') vol. v. No. 9, pp. 120 f.

[5] *Ibid.* vol. iii. No. 10. No doubt Jesus weeps from human tenderness, but there must also be something more. ' Here was the Creator of the World at a scene of death, seeing the issue of His gracious handiwork. Would not He revert in thought to the hour of creation, when He went forth from the bosom of the Father, to bring all things into existence ? ' (p. 134).

[6] *Ibid.* vol. iii. p. 166.

[7] *Ibid.* vol. vi. p. 64.

zeal to reject those who 'begin by being Sabellians, go on to be Nestorians, and tend to be Ebionites and deny Christ's Divinity altogether,' Newman can, though with reservations, touch on the figure of one who acts a part,[1] and in another context apply exactly the figures of 'an instrument,' 'a tabernacle,' etc.,[2] and can venture to say that, 'though man, He was not, strictly speaking, in the English sense of the word, *a* man; He was not such as one of us, and one out of a number. . . . As He had no earthly father, so has He no human personality; we may not speak of Him as we speak of any individual man, acting from, and governed by, a human intelligence within Him, but He was God, acting not only as God but now through the flesh also, when He would.'[3] But we need not read much further in the same sermon to find a striking proof of how closely this conception is associated with the mystical type of religion in which the thought of infused grace appears, a proof perhaps of the temptation to Apollinarianism, which seems almost inseparable from this type: 'When He poured out His precious Blood upon the Cross, it was not a man's blood, though it belonged to His manhood, but blood full of power and virtue, instinct with life and grace, as issuing most mysteriously from Him who was the Creator of the world. And the case is the same in every successive communication of Himself to individual Christians.'

But before we allow this note of Sacramental mysticism to ring out in its fulness, we must take up another no less important and in its development no less typical line, that of active religion. During the first months of the Oxford Movement proper, Froude writes of a few acquaintances: 'I think they are our sort, enthusiasts of a sort there are not many of. A real genuine enthusiast is the rarest thing going; yet on T's authority we may aspire to that rank.'[4] Only a few decades earlier, in the milieu out of which Froude came, it would have been held particularly

[1] *Parochial and Plain Sermons*, vol. iii. p 165. [2] *Ibid.* vol. vi. pp. 64, 66.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 62. It seems difficult to see any distinction between this view and pure Apollinarianism.

[4] Froude, *Remains*, vol. i. part 1, p. 332. Certainly it had been in a more limited and technical sense that the Church of the eighteenth and early nineteenth century expressed its condemnation of 'religious enthusiasm,' as, *e.g.*, in the Bampton Lectures of G. F. Nott in 1802 (Storr, *The Development of English Theology in the Nineteenth Century*, pp. 75,78). But to venture to be proud of this despised name, as Froude was, shows a new spirit.

improper, whether in word or deed, to pay homage to any kind of 'religious enthusiasm'—that was the very hall-mark of Evangelicalism. That the Oxford school incorporated in the old system this objectionable 'enthusiasm,' and that this gives us right to speak of Neo-Anglicanism as the inheritor of Evangelicalism, has previously been pointed out. But it is scarcely sufficient to constitute more than a distant kinship, a general parallelism: enthusiasm is the monopoly of no school. But a close examination of the nature of active religious feeling gives us closer points of contact.

This is particularly the case with the intensive application to the individual of the awful and gracious reality of the religious life, and the requirement of conversion, definite personal decision. That the pastoral zeal of Neo-Anglicanism—a zeal the strength and genuineness of which outweigh a multitude of sins—traces its ancestry to the Evangelical Movement, is one of the most interesting facts of recent English Church history, though it is rather difficult to establish the pedigree with genealogical precision. But what we find of religious individualism in the Oxford Movement is transformed, at times beyond recognition, by the academic atmosphere, stamped with the mark of a fastidious intellectual culture, which partly conceals the driving-force of the leading ideas.

Christian literature probably contains few more striking presentations of the immortality of the individual soul than Newman's sermon on 'The Individuality of the Soul.'[1] Here, as usual, we find the master-hand in the faculty of giving a new freshness and originality to thoughts which have been obscured by familiarity. 'Survey some populous town; crowds are pouring through the streets; some on foot, some in carriages; while the shops are full, and the houses too, could we see into them. Every part of it is full of life. Hence we gain a general idea of splendour, magnificence, opulence, and energy. But what is the truth? Why, that every being in that great concourse is his own centre, and all things about him are but shades. . . . No one outside of him can really touch him, can touch his soul, his immortality; he must live with himself for ever. He has a depth within him unfathomable, an infinite abyss of existence; and the scene, in which

[1] *Parochial and Plain Sermons*, vol. iv. p. 6.

he bears part for the moment, is but like a gleam of sunshine upon its surface.' We read in history how multitudes of men have been killed in various ways, but, 'we cannot understand that a multitude is a collection of immortal souls,' that 'all those millions upon millions of human beings who ever trod the earth and saw the sun successively, are at this very moment in existence all together.'[1] Think of all those whom we have just seen once in our lives and who then disappeared to us: 'But if we have once seen any child of Adam, we have seen an immortal soul. . . . Moreover, every one of all the souls which have ever been on the earth is . . . in one of two spiritual states, so distinct from one another, that the one is the subject of God's favour, and the other under His wrath; the one on the way to eternal happiness, the other to eternal misery.'[2]

It is the marvel of Divine Providence that He can look to and care for each individual in this endless stream of beings. As the Lord during His earthly life acted to everyone who came in His way with inimitable gentleness and consideration, the qualities that form the very perfection of friendliness among men, so God acts with each of us. 'God beholds thee individually, whoever thou art. He "calls thee by thy name." He sees thee, and understands thee, as He made thee. . . . He views thee in thy day of rejoicing, and thy day of sorrow. He sympathises in thy hopes and thy temptations. . . . He compasses thee round and bears thee in His arms. . . . He notes thy very countenance whether smiling or in tears, whether healthful or sickly. He looks tenderly upon thy hands and thy feet; He hears thy voice, the beating of thy heart, and thy very breathing. Thou dost not love thyself better than He loves thee. Thou canst not shrink from pain more than He dislikes thy bearing it. . . . Thou art not only His creature . . . thou art a man redeemed and sanctified, favoured with a portion of that glory and blessedness which flows from Him everlastingly unto the Only-Begotten.' But yet He deviates not a hair's-breadth from His justice and holiness. 'He who can condemn to the woe everlasting, though He weeps and laments beforehand, and who, when once the sentence of condemnation has gone forth, will wipe

[1] *Parochial and Plain Sermons*, p. 82. [2] *Ibid.* p. 86.

out altogether the remembrance of us, "and know us not." The tares were "bound in bundles," for the burning, indiscriminately, promiscuously, contemptuously.'[1] So it is for us not to let Him call in vain.[2]

Once in Baptism God's call to every Christian has gone forth, and in it He gives His Kingdom in possession, even as Samuel anointed David to be King.[3] But again and again the call goes out in various ways. 'He has called by peace amid sorrow, or restlessness in joy; by remorse for past sin, or by the glowing thrill of some self-sacrificing conquest; by voices of terror or love; by fear and by hope; by glimpses of Heaven or by dread of Hell; by thoughts of everlasting burnings or by sight of His outstretched Arms, once nailed on the Cross, to embrace the whole world, and still extended to protect and to receive us. He is now again calling us by the thickening tokens of His coming.'[4] Above all, Christ is always near us. 'His call is a thing which takes place now. We think it took place in the Apostles' days; but we do not believe in it; we do not look out for it in our own case. We have not eyes to see the Lord.'[5] It is no use to desire to put ourselves back into the Apostles' days; His nearest did not know Him. 'I say that Christ, the sinless Son of God, might be living now in the world as our next-door neighbour, and perhaps we not find it out,'[6] just as we cannot distinguish by outward signs who are on the way to become saints of God. And now He is present, though concealed, in His Church, in His poor, whom He made 'tokens and instruments of His

[1] *Parochial and Plain Sermons* ('A Particular Providence as revealed in the Gospel') vol. iii. No. 9, pp. 124, 127.

[2] Again it is Pusey who adopts the strongest colours, when the eternal Judgment is seen as the consequence of neglect to listen to God's call: '"I also will laugh at your calamity, I will mock when your fear cometh." We can imagine the scornful laugh of devils, as they jeer at the wretched folly of the miserable beings who were deluded by them and are their prey; many have thought that they heard it. . . . But that Almighty God should again and again tell us, that He should "laugh and have them in derision" (Ps. ii. 4, xxxvii. 13, lix. 8), that He, who, we know, hath no passions, should "mock" at His creatures' misery, how does it picture to us that utter alienation from Him, which shall live on eternally, disregarded, unnoticed by Him, in Hell' (*Sermons from Advent to Whitsuntide*, p. 185).

[3] Newman, *op. cit.* ('The Call of David') vol. viii. No. 4, p. 53.

[4] Pusey, *Sermons from Advent to Whitsuntide*, p. 184.

[5] Newman, *op. cit.* ('Divine Call') vol. viii. No. 2, p. 24.

[6] *Ibid.* ('Christ hidden from the World') vol. iv. No. 16, p. 242.

presence'[1] in the Sacrament. 'We are slow to master the great truth, that Christ is, as it were, walking among us, and by His hand, or eye, or voice, bidding us follow Him.'[2] Who will recognise Him and be ready to follow Him on the day of His Coming of all these worldly Christians, whose souls have as it were rusted and lost their fine sensibility?[3] 'O fearful thought! the bridal train is sweeping by—Angels are there—the just made perfect are there—little children, and holy teachers, and white-robed saints, and martyrs washed in blood; the marriage of the Lamb is come, and His wife hath made herself ready. She has already attired herself; while we have been sleeping, she has been robing; she has been adding jewel to jewel and grace to grace; she has been gathering in her chosen ones, one by one, and has been exercising them in holiness, and purifying them for her Lord; and now her marriage hour is come. The holy Jerusalem is descending, and a loud voice proclaims, "Behold! the Bridegroom cometh! go ye out to meet Him!" but we, alas! are but dazzled with the blaze of light, and neither welcome the sound, nor obey it.'[4]

Thus the Apocalyptic note chimes in with this preaching of conversion. For it is conversion, personal decision, just as much as in any revivalist preaching, however much one may look down on its emotionalism. Nor is there wanting experience of the peculiar emphasis on feeling in conversion. 'The beginnings of conversion have generally the sweetness with which God draws away the soul from the deadly sweetness by which it was killing itself';[5] then come backslidings and trials, when God seems to cast back the converted soul into its former misery.[6] But the essence of conversion is the surrender of the will,[7] the submission of the will to God's Will for His service. 'God willeth thee to be saved; will thou it also; will it with a steadfast will; will it with a whole heart; will

[1] *Parochial and Plain Sermons*, p. 250; cp. Pusey, *op. cit.* p. 68.

[2] Newman, *ibid.* vol. viii. p. 24.

[3] *Ibid.* ('Watching') vol. iv. No. 22, p. 328. [4] *Ibid.* p. 330.

[5] Cp. a sermon on 'Our Risen Lord's Love for Penitents' (Pusey, *op. cit.* p. 264): 'He who called Magdalene, in her calleth thee. He who by His Sweetness in her soul, drew her to cast away all this world's deadly sweetness, will speak to thine, if thou wilt hear her.'

[6] Pusey, *op. cit.* p. 100.

[7] 'The essence of true conversion is a *surrender* of himself' (Newman, *op. cit.* vol. v. p. 241).

it at whatever cost; and pray Him to uphold thy will, and thou wilt be saved. . . . Obey *now* His Voice or ask *now* for grace to obey it; purpose *now* in utter mistrust of self, yet trembling trust in Him, to break off some besetting sin, to cherish some neglected grace.'[1] Thus the way of conversion is the way of obedience and service, not of intoxication of feeling. It is no use to search, whether one is really convinced of the truth of the Christian 'mysteries.' 'We must ask ourselves, not "Am I thoroughly convinced and certain that these mysterious doctrines are true?" for that is a matter over which we have no control; we cannot feel certain by trying to feel ever so much; and God will not require of us impossibilities. But what we must ask ourselves is this, "Is my conduct such as it would be if I was thoroughly convinced of them?"'[2] It is not without reason that Isaac Williams called the chief portal of his cathedral Obedience.

The application of conversion in Tractarian preaching is, however, considerably limited by the doctrine of Baptismal regeneration. Pusey maintains that there are men who continue in the grace of Baptism and for whom their later spiritual development is a continual growth. The crisis of conversion is thus not regarded in the Methodist sense as necessary for every Christian; and as little need the manner be the same in every case, but may vary from a sudden violent check through an external influence to a cautious guiding into the right path. Nor does conversion confer any title to security.[3] Anyhow the horror of the very word 'conversion,' which we are told was sometimes to be found in late Tractarian circles of the static type,[4] must not be considered as characteristic of the original Oxford Movement, at least not of its progressive, religiously creative side.

When someone expressed to Froude the opinion that one might get good by taking part in a service without receiving

[1] Pusey, *op. cit.* p. 135. [2] Froude, *Remains*, vol. i. part 2, p. 68.

[3] See Pusey's sermon on 'Conversion' in *Plain Sermons by Contributors to the Tracts for the Times*, vol. iii. No. 92, pp. 312, 322. Cp. Newman's sermon on 'Sudden Conversions,' *ibid.* vol. v. No. 16, pp. 308–315; the real deep-down reformation has always the character of a growth, and the suddenness of the crisis is only apparent.

[4] Cp. Clement C. J. Webb, *A Century of Anglican Theology*, p. 34.

the Sacrament, he replied: 'Really! I thought obedience was the very condition of receiving benefit from prayer.' And when the friend ventured to object that the very seeing of the sacred acts, and hearing the prayers, did people good, he got the characteristic answer: 'Ah! the regular Protestant way. You want a Church to preach the prayers in. . . . No, R.; make two or three saints, that is the way to set to work.'[1]

Thus the motive of obedience naturally becomes subordinate to a greater, which in this, as in other movements, maintains its central position in an intensive religious life, the motive of holiness. We have had a glimpse of it already, but now it is for us to try to fix more closely its nature and importance for Tractarian piety.

A number of factors combine to put the ideal of holiness in the forefront. Even the strong consciousness of the majesty and awful nearness of the Deity was enough to give a special weight to the requirement of an εὐφημία of the life as of the lips, a preparation of the soul and will to draw near unto the Holy One. But apart from that the main lines in English religion, which here join, converge precisely in the ideal of sanctity, though sometimes more religiously, sometimes more moralistically conceived. It has previously been shown, how the thought of Christian perfection after having appeared with full strength in Law, perhaps through Wesley as an intervening link, decisively influenced Alexander Knox. The deep influence which Law's ideal of holiness and requirement of perfection exercised on the Oxford Movement, it has itself attested, and it might be exemplified in numerous points. But his influence on Wesley and Knox is of interest, especially because it witnesses that Evangelicalism was in no way alien to such preaching. Newman's statement that Thomas Scott's dictum 'Holiness rather than peace' rang in his ears for a number of years,[2] would be enough to establish the fact that the requirement of holiness belonged to the Evangelical legacy to Tractarianism, even if one of the earliest of his first sermons of the Evangelical period had not borne the title, 'Holiness Necessary for Future Blessedness' (on Heb. xii. 4, 'Holiness without which no man

[1] Froude, *Remains*, vol. i. part 1, p. 435.
[2] *Apologia*, p. 61 (1908, p. 5).

shall see the Lord ').[1] The above-mentioned fact that Pusey's first sermon of 1828 was on the same text, points also in this direction.[2]

On the other hand, the requirement of holiness with support of the Liturgy[3] was at home in the main line of Anglican Christianity. Of this Law is in his measure a witness. In Caroline Anglicanism it is brought out in full strength by Jeremy Taylor in his books ' The Rule and Exercises of Holy Living ' and ' The Rule and Exercises of Holy Dying,' and the thought of the practice of holiness as a necessary condition for attainment of eternal bliss[4] runs side by side with the Evangelical confidence through the whole history of Anglican piety and theology. In the seventeenth century it created an Anglican casuistry, which we find as plainly in Baxter's ' Christian Directory ' as in Taylor's ' Rule of Conscience.'[5] It may at times degenerate into a flat moralism, an ethical preaching of Pelagian temper—and witnesses of this are not wanting, as will presently be shown, in the material which is the object of our investigation—but it came also to be one of the foundations of the grand apologetic building, in which Bishop Butler framed the orthodox answer to the Deists in his ' Analogy.'[6] Here the direct prominence given to the importance of moral action in the formation of a character in agreement with the moral government of the world[7] seems to be of greater weight than the actual ethical proof of God's existence and the doctrine of probability, which builds on a parallelism between the natural and the moral order of the world, as also between knowledge and action. We let reasons

[1] *Parochial and Plain Sermons*, vol. i. p. 1 (of 1826).

[2] Liddon, *Life of Pusey*, vol. i. p. 144.

[3] Cp. how Palmer, in his *Treatise on the Church*, to prove the English Church's *note of holiness*, states that ' her prayers, her hymns, all her services, breathe a horror of sin, and an ardent desire for spiritual holiness and perfection ' (vol. i. p. 235).

[4] Cp. Bishop Wilson : ' It is the greatest blindness to hope for eternal happiness, without preparing for it in the whole course of our lives by holy living ' (*Works*, vol. iv. p. 209).

[5] Cp. H. H. Henson, *Studies in English Religion in the Seventeenth Century*, where one chapter (pp. 171–210) treats of ' Casuistry.'

[6] Cp. Pattison, ' Tendencies of Religious Thought in England ' (1688–1750), in *Essays and Reviews* (3rd ed., p. 286).

[7] *The Works of Joseph Butler*, ed. by W. E. Gladstone (Oxford, 1897), vol i. p. 112.

of probability determine our actions; should they then not equally be recognised as operating in the region of knowledge and thought?[1] Newman gives Keble the honour of having added to Butler's system by a proof of faith and love;[2] when these have built a bridge between two beings, then indications of the will of the One may be enough to create complete certainty in the other.[3] Against this background we have to see a special conception of the importance of holiness, as we have already noticed in Newman's case: the thought of a complete parallelism between right belief and right doctrine, and of action as the chief criterion of faith. We have previously seen how the thought of probability in the sphere of doctrine led to an anxious search for everything that may be essential, to the requirement of a maximum of doctrine as the necessary correlative of a maximum of life.

It was the thought of the presence of the Saints, the consciousness of acting under their eyes, which gave its seriousness and depth to the thought of the Church and the Communion of Saints. But the greatness of the Saints comes from the fact that they are witnesses of Him who sanctified them—of whose work their own life is a part and a continuation. The miracles of the Saviour have not been fewer since than before His Ascension: 'those works of higher grace and more abiding fruit, wrought in the souls of men, from the first hour till now—the captives of His power, the ransomed heirs of His kingdom, whom He has called by His Spirit working in due season, and led on from strength to strength, till they appear before His Face in Zion.'[4] In the life of the Saints Eternity is revealed within the limits of time: 'Men there are who, in a single moment of their lives, have shown a superhuman height and majesty of mind which it would take ages for them to employ on its proper objects, and, as it were, to exhaust; and who by such passing flashes, like rays of the sun, and the darting of lightning, give token of their immortality, give token to us that they are but Angels in disguise,

[1] Gladstone, *Studies Subsidiary to the Works of Bishop Butler* (Oxford, 1896), p. 8.

[2] Newman, *Apologia*, p. 78 (ed. 1908, p. 19).

[3] Cp. Newman in Tract No. 8, *The Gospel a Law of Liberty*.

[4] Newman, *Parochial and Plain Sermons* ('Use of Saints' Days'), vol. ii. No. 32, p. 393.

the elect of God, sealed for eternal life, and destined to judge the world, and to reign with Christ for ever. Yet they are suddenly taken away, and we have hardly recognised them, when we lose them.'[1] Therefore also the exercise and practice of holiness must be a necessary condition of the attainment of salvation, because it alone makes us sharers in the world of eternity, it alone puts us in a position to enjoy its blessings. Even in Newman's sermon, in 1826 (*i.e.* from the Evangelical period), 'Holiness Necessary for Future Blessedness,' we find these words: 'We see, then, that holiness, or inward separation from the world, is necessary to our admission into heaven, because heaven is *not* heaven, is not a place of happiness *except* to the holy.'[2]

This holiness, no doubt, in the last instance, depends on the fact that God planted the principle of holiness in the heart, but its growth and improvement depend on the good works in which it finds its expression—here we touch on a profound problem, the theoretical investigation and formulation of which in Tractarianism will be the object of special treatment—all acts of love and self-sacrifice, all prayers and spiritual exercises have as their first object to train the mind, to hallow the heart, and to 'prepare us for the future presence of God.'[3] Deeper experience soon showed Newman the insufficiency of self-discipline; though God's own work, it always remains incomplete upon earth, 'and the holiest men have remains and stains of sin.'[4] But at the same time the ideal of perfect holiness shines out with ever-clearer brightness: 'In heaven, sin will be utterly destroyed in every elect soul. We shall have no earthly wishes, no tendencies to disobedience or irreligion, no love of the world or the flesh, to draw us off from supreme devotion to God. We shall have our Saviour's holiness fulfilled in us, and be able to love God without drawback or infirmity. That indeed will be a full reward of all

[1] *Parochial and Plain Sermons* ('The Greatness and Littleness of Human Life'), vol. iv. No. 14, p. 218.

[2] *Ibid.* vol. i. No. 1, p. 76. It deserves to be emphasised that in the matter of the motive of holiness, perhaps the most central religious motive, a continuous and really unbroken line connects Newman's Evangelical days with his latest Anglican period.

[3] *Ibid.* vol. i. No. 1, p. 9.

[4] *Ibid.* ('Love of Religion, a New Life,' May 3, 1840), vol. vii. No. 13, p. 188.

our longings here, to praise and serve God eternally with a single and perfect heart, in the midst of His Temple. What a time will that be, when all will be perfected in us which at present is but feebly begun! Then we shall see how the Angels worship God. We shall see the calmness, the intenseness, the purity of their worship. We shall see the awful sight, the Throne of God, and the Seraphim before and around it crying "Holy." '[1] There was scarcely need of the echo of Isaiah's call to make us understand that here we are on a religious height, where all doctrine of works, all teaching of reward for moral actions is left far behind.

But it is also significant of the growth of the motive of holiness to see how sweet, gentle, and warm notes in time begin more clearly to make themselves heard.[2] 'O how comfortable, pleasant, sweet, soothing and satisfying it is to lead a holy life—the life of Angels! It is difficult at first; but with God's grace, all things are possible. O how pleasant to have done with sin! how good and joyful to flee temptation and to resist evil!'[3] No doubt the perspective in the background is the gradual exercise of holiness, instead of the sudden victory in the penitential struggle, but does this fact annihilate the essential identity of the fundamental feeling of joy in God, of strangeness from sin, which in both cases is looked for as the result? It is particularly in his last Anglican years that the ideal of holiness calls forth these pleasanter feelings in Newman's preaching. 'I wish it were possible, my brethren, to lead men to greater holiness and more faithful obedience by setting before them the high and abundant joys which they have who serve God: "In His Presence is fulness of joy," "the well of life"; and they are satisfied with "the plenteousness of His house," and "drink of His pleasures as out of a river"; but this is, I know, just what most persons will not believe. . . . They do not at all deny either the duty or the expedience of leading a new and holy life; but they cannot understand how it can be pleasant.'[4]

[1] *Parochial and Plain Sermons*, vol. vii. No. 13, p. 189.
[2] Cp. *ibid.* vol. iv. p. 316.
[3] *Ibid.* vol. vii. p. 191.
[4] *Ibid.* ('Religion Pleasant to the Religious') vol. vii. No. 14, p. 197. 'The pleasures of holiness are far more pleasant to the holy than the pleasures of sin to the sinner.' Self-discipline in holiness comes out again in the characteristic words of the conclusion: 'Think of all this, my Brethren, and rouse

Newman's preaching of holiness reaches perhaps its highest point in a sermon of 1842 on 'The Crucifixion': 'Let us pray God to give us *all* graces; and while, in the first place, we pray that He would make us holy, really holy, let us also pray Him to give us the beauty of holiness, which consists in tender and eager affection towards our Lord and Saviour; which is, in the case of the Christian, what beauty of person is to the outward man, so that through God's mercy our souls may have, not strength and health only, but a sort of bloom and comeliness; and that as we grow older in body, we may, year by year, grow more youthful in spirit.'[1]

It agrees well with what was stated above, that in Newman we can also follow continuously the thought of the parallelism between moral action and religious knowledge, see it grow from the Evangelical period to the beginning of the great crisis. Even in 1825 he can expound the view that he who obeys the command of Scripture, by his docility and purity is better equipped than others to advance in religious truth, and that he who does so 'may have an inward witness arising from obedience.'[2] Couched in this moderate form, the idea is little but an exposition of our Lord's words, that he who does the will of His Father shall be able to judge of the doctrine. But in its completeness we find the thought first in the proper High Anglican period of his life, when, after having passed through the Evangelical as well as the Liberal stages, and learnt to mistrust as subjective the determinations both of feeling and reason, he believes he has found an objective criterion of

yourselves, and run forward with a good courage on your way toward Heaven. . . . Strive to enter in at the strait gate. Strive to get holier and holier every day, that you may be worthy to stand before the Son of Man' (p. 203). In the tone of deeper mysticism which is peculiar to him, Pusey has a rapturous passage on the heavenly perfection as a fusion into the Godhead: 'He, the Fountain of all Good, shall overstream them with the Torrents of His Pleasure, and enfold them, and fill them with His Love, and irradiate them with His Light. Their being shall be His Being, and they shall be themselves only to be not themselves, only that there may be beings to be ever filled with the Thrilling, Pure, Holy, Exstatic Love of God. They shall be out of themselves in the Absorbing Love of God, and God in His Boundless Love shall dwell in them' (Pusey, *Sermons during the Season from Advent to Whitsuntide*, p. 119).

[1] *Parochial and Plain Sermons*, vol. vii. No. 10, p. 134.

[2] *Ibid.* ('Inward Witness to the Truth of the Gospel'), vol. viii. No. 8, p. 122, etc.

truth, and the reality of the object of faith. In obedience faith is tested. It is no good to have the demonstration of feeling, an inward conviction, that one is saved. Doubtless a certain quietness of mind and adjustment of feeling belong to the Christian's equipment. But in a sermon on 1 John ii. 3, 'Hereby do we know that we know Him if we keep His Commandments,' he says: 'The Apostle does not insist upon it, as if it were sure to follow, if our hearts do but grow into these two chief objects, the view of God in Christ, and the diligent aim to obey Him in our conduct.'[1] And just at the time when he definitely turned his back on Liberalism, he urges the same idea of the overwhelming strength of the proof from obedience: 'For ourselves, let us obey God's voice in our hearts, and I will venture to say we shall have no doubts practically formidable about the truth of Scripture. Find out the man who strictly obeys the law within him, and yet is an unbeliever as regards the Bible, and then it will be time enough to consider all that variety of proof by which the truth of the Bible is confirmed to us. . . . Our doubts, if we have any, will be found to arise after *disobedience*. . . . And if we but obey God strictly, in time (through His blessing) faith will become like sight.'[2] The parallelism between faith and conduct, which in the last quoted passage takes the shape of a parallel between inward and outward revelation, is further emphasised in connection with the anti-intellectual attitude which dominates Newman's view of the theory of knowledge after his conversion from Liberalism.[3]

[1] *Parochial and Plain Sermons* ('Saving Knowledge') vol. ii. No. 14, p. 153; cp. Pusey in *Plain Sermons by Contributors to the Tracts for the Times* ('Obedience the Condition of Knowing the Truth'), vol. iii. No. 81, pp. 133 f.

[2] *Ibid.* ('Religious Faith Rational') vol. i. No. 15, p. 201. This sermon is referred by Copeland to May 24, 1829.

[3] The requirement of the way of obedience and action as the only sure way to religious certainty is properly only an application of the principle of the primacy of conscience as the organ of religious knowledge, the principle which dominates *University Sermons* and is one of the corner-stones in the theory of knowledge developed full-blown in the *Grammar of Assent*. The principle is more vigorously formulated by W. G. Ward in his *Ideal of a Christian Church* than elsewhere in the Oxford Movement (see especially ch. ix. 'The Supremacy of Conscience in the Pursuit of Moral and Religious Truth'). It is not possible to discuss in detail the connection between the Oxford doctrine of the relation of right belief and right conduct with later Pragmatism; cp, W. Ward, *W. G. Ward and the Oxford Movement*, p. 393, and his lecture on Newman's philosophy in *Last Lectures* (London, 1918), p. 90. The essential

In Newman's, as in certain other forms of pragmatism, this gets its religious motive in the doctrine of the darkening of the reason by the Fall: 'What then is intellect itself, as exercised in the world, but a fruit of the Fall, not found in paradise or in heaven, more than in little children, and at the utmost but tolerated in the Church, and only not incompatible with the regenerate mind?'[1] The reason of unbelief in a man, his lack of receptivity for conviction, is therefore not to be sought in the intellectual but in the moral sphere. Single sins may have the most extensive consequences: 'This is generally acknowledged as regards a sceptical temper of mind, which commonly is assailed by argument in vain, the root of the evil lying deeper, viz., in habits of vice, which however the guilty parties strenuously maintain to be quite a distinct matter, to relate to their conduct, and to have no influence whatever upon their reason or their opinions.'[2] Therefore progress in holiness is intimately connected with progress in religious knowledge. It is one of the chief consequences for ourselves, that, if we perform our religious duties, at the same time we advance in the knowledge of God. 'Our duties to God and man are not only duties done to Him, but they are means of enlightening our eyes

difference between the pragmatism of the Oxford school and that of later Catholic Modernism needs scarcely to be pointed out: for the former the practical verification of a doctrine was never decisive for its absolute content of truth; it must also be seen in connection with the postulated parallelism between the complete dogma and the complete sanctified life. No accusation of concealed scepticism can therefore justly be directed against the Oxford Movement.

[1] *Parochial and Plain Sermons* ('The State of Innocence') vol. v. No. 8, p. 112. The contemptuous judgment of reason is modified further on: 'I am not using light words of what is a great gift of God, and one distinguishing mark of man over the brutes, our reason; I have spoken of the particular exercises and developments, in which it has its life in the world' (p. 113).

[2] *Ibid.* ('Moral Consequences of Single Sins') vol. iv. No. 3, p. 44. We find a good example of the same process of thought in another sermon delivered nearly two years later, 'Moral Effects of Communion with God'; a man who is easily accessible to doubts, and gradually slips into a general scepticism, cannot be convinced by reasons: 'Why? Because the next world is no reality to him; it only exists in his mind in the form of certain conclusions from certain reasonings. It is but an inference; and never can be more, never can be present to his mind, until he acts instead of arguing. Let him but act as if the next world were before him; let him but give himself to such devotional exercises as we ought to observe in the presence of an Almighty, All-Holy, and All-Merciful God, and it will be a rare case indeed if his difficulties do not vanish' (*ibid.* vol. iv. No. 15, p. 231).

and making our faith apprehensive. Every act of obedience has a tendency to strengthen our convictions about heaven. Every sacrifice makes us more zealous, every self-denial makes us more devoted.'[1] So it is by the way of obedience that we can approach God and win knowledge of Him. All intellectual activity, all investigation of the essence and principles of religion, though a field for the exercise of great and admirable intellectual qualities, are rather a hindrance than an advantage for the soul's attainment of its highest aim: 'We know two things of the Angels—that they cry, Holy, Holy, Holy, and that they do God's bidding.'[2]

However great a part obedience and works play in Newman's theology, he is guarded from the danger of Pelagianism by his deeply religious conception of God and also by what he learnt of that type of piety which first left traces in his development. In 1826 he spoke of how good works were to be regarded as a result of 'that holy principle which God implants in the heart,'[3] and this thought he seems never to have lost. Nor does he ever forget that the perfection, which it is the aim of the Christian to attain, is a gift from above. 'Christ has purchased for us what we lost in Adam, our garment of innocence.'[4] But it is interesting to see how the same idea of obedience consistently developed, when it lacks the safeguards just named, leads almost inevitably to a Pelagianising position.

Like Newman, Hurrell Froude sought in Christian conduct an objective criterion in opposition to the subjective indication of religious feeling. 'We are not indeed called upon to strain after lofty feelings, and to form great conceptions of God; but to set ourselves patiently and contentedly to work, dull and unspiritual as our inclinations may be. We are to *do* the will of our Father. This is what He requires of us—

[1] *Parochial and Plain Sermons* ('Difficulty of Realising Sacred Privileges'), vol. vi. No. 8, p. 100.

[2] *Ibid.* ('Ignorance of Evil') vol. viii. No. 8, p. 264.

[3] *Ibid.* vol. i. No. 1, p. 8. How this is connected with the idea of Predestination there is no space to develop in detail. In a sermon of 1840, 'The Power of the Will,' he indicates his view of the problem of Free-Will (*ibid.* vol. v. No. 24, p. 353): 'Doubtless by nature our will is in bondage; we cannot will good; but by the grace of God our will has been set free; we obtain, to a certain extent, the gift of free-will; henceforth we can will, or not will.'

[4] *Ibid.* vol. viii, No. 18, p. 367.

and to leave all the rest to Him.'[1] It is a complete mistake that religion is a matter of feeling: 'The temper which alone deserves the name of religion is just as much a habit, just as much the consequence of discipline, as any other temper that can be named.'[2] So discipline, the systematic training of the will, becomes the only way to religious conduct as well as to religious knowledge. This idea is perhaps most clearly expressed in a sermon entitled 'Knowledge of Duty attainable only by Practising.'[3] We need habit and practice in our duty to God as in our duty to our neighbour. We require the practice of the presence of God. To have God present seems to the unfamiliar to be impossible without destroying all freedom and unconstrainedness, and making life a burden. 'People connect the idea of religion with moroseness and melancholy.' They are ill at ease and constrained 'at the thought of God's Presence, because to them He is a stranger.' As in human life, acquaintance can only be made by means of conversation. Unconstrainedness and joy in God's Presence is possible only to those who endeavour most to live a serious and holy life. Those, therefore, who late in life come to a serious disposition of mind, 'assume an unnatural voice and manner,' they are not accustomed to live in God's Presence. 'They wish to feel as if they knew and loved God all at once. . . . Thus they prove by their example how impossible it is to get a real knowledge of God's ways by any other instruction than the experience acquired by serving Him.'

Examples of this line of thought might be multiplied. It is not merely the ethical knowledge which is only acquired by action, but religious knowledge in general—or rather there is no real distinction between them. 'We are to do His will, and thus we shall gradually understand the doctrine which He has taught us concerning Himself.'[4] Therefore heretical doctrine is a matter of the heart, as well as of the intellect. There is a complete parallelism This idea has scarcely anywhere had a more characteristic expression than in Froude's thoughts of a period some years before the Oxford Movement,

[1] Froude, *Remains*, vol. i. part 2, p. 76 (in a sermon, 'The Path of Duty not Difficult to Faith').

[2] *Ibid.* ('Religious Uses of Industry') vol. i. part 2, p. 27.

[3] *Ibid.* vol. i. part 1, pp. 95–108.

[4] *Ibid.* vol. i. part 2, p. 93.

while Newman and he were comparatively strangers to one another: 'On the Connection between a right Faith and right Practice; on the ἦθος of Heresy.'[1] There is a necessary connection between views and character: 'The temper which generates and constitutes the latter assimilates itself with and has a natural tendency to promote the former and *vice versa*.' Multiplicity of opinions is really multiplicity of characters. Nor would a certain opinion be able to bind men together in as high a degree as is actually the case, if it did not in the last instance rest on common temperament. When we condemn certain opinions as sinful, that really applies to the frame of mind which is expressed in these opinions. This gives a meaning, *e.g.*, to the damnatory clauses of the Athanasian Creed: behind a heretical doctrine must be a sinful temperament. So faith, like life, becomes a matter of the will; the way to salvation is through self-discipline. Here we find a moralism which seems to be quite thoroughgoing. We are like children in the state of innocence—no one can be more alien than Froude to the thought that man is born in sin, though perhaps later on he would have made use of the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration to make his standpoint dogmatically unassailable. In a sermon on All Saints' Day he says:[2] 'There was a time when it was in the power of each of us to be as great a Saint as any of those whom we this day commemorate, when we might have earned for ourselves a place in heaven as high as that of Noah, Daniel, and Job; when, if the expression is not presumptuous, we might have purified ourselves even as Christ is pure. Our Lord Jesus Christ was once a Child, He was brought up subject to His parents, He was tempted in all things like unto us, and by the time He was thirty years of age He was, in His human Nature, what the Gospel presents Him to us in His Divine, "the Glory of the Only-Begotten of the Father, full of Grace and Truth." This was the effect of thirty years of self-discipline, begun from childhood.'[3] 'But he who has once fallen from the state of

[1] July 16, 1827 (*Remains*, vol. i. part 1, pp. 114–119).

[2] *Ibid.* ('The Duty of Aiming at the Highest Excellence') vol. i. part 2, p. 139.

[3] This is not the only time Froude, more or less consciously, touches on astonishingly modern ideas. He seems really to have had a view of inspiration, which for his time and surroundings was remarkably free. No wonder

innocence which he might have preserved can never win back what he has lost. Doubtless by sincere repentance he can participate in God's forgiveness of sins, but repentance does not place sinners in the same situation to that from which they fell by sinning. . . . We shall never lose the marks of our present wilful negligence.[1] Doubtless those who have fallen from this state can come to their Father with a broken and contrite heart, if they have made a definite resolve to lead a new life, and are conscious of endeavouring, however ineffectually, to make themselves such as God approves. It is their own work, which in the last resort will help them. He does not expect of them that strength and dignity of character which they have now lost the power of acquiring; He does not require of them that they should show themselves as men in His service, and do the great things which they might have done, if they had served Him perseveringly from the first. To rank with the great Saints of God, with the glorious company of the Apostles, and the noble army of Martyrs, is indeed no longer theirs. But it is still given them to sit at meat at their Master's Table; their sins have not utterly excluded them from His Presence, if they will acknowledge their abject condition. . . . Their safety now rests on their humility.'[2]

Should more witness be required, it is said in a recently quoted sermon on the formation of human characters: 'Except by our own exertions they cannot be changed at all. For we are all of us, in a certain sense, our own creation. . . . Our present state of mind, be it what it may,

that the editors of *Remains* felt compelled to explain away an utterance like this: 'We cannot be certain that the inspiration which dictated the Sacred Writings differed at all in kind, or very materially in degree, from that which suggested such a work as Bishop Butler's *Analogy*' (vol. i. part 1, p. 126); or: 'As far as I can see it is perfectly gratuitous to believe that, beyond the matters which they were commissioned to reveal, their writings are more infallible than the compositions of other very wise men.' Elsewhere he seems to maintain a certain relativity in the formulation of Creeds (p. 143), or to have some idea of a development in Nature (p. 110).

[1] *Remains*, vol. i. part 2, p. 149 (in a sermon 'Repentance not Equivalent in this Life to Innocence'). He goes on to say: 'It is quite conceivable that sin may be completely pardoned, and yet its consequences not entirely removed' (p. 150).

[2] *Ibid.* ('Innocence of Children the Highest Moral Condition') vol. i. part 2, p. 171.

is the result, not of nature, or of accident, but of our own past conduct; and could never have become what it is, unless we had acted as we have done. . . . And now we are what we are with much still to lose, and with power of regaining much that we have lost. Even yet we may in some measure retrace our steps; and as by acting ill we have made ourselves bad, so by acting well we may make ourselves better.'[1] Even though it is said further on, 'We are taught that God's Holy Spirit will assist us in the hard task of retracing our steps and healing the diseases of our souls,'[2] this does not lessen the clearly Pelagian character of the view we find here. This is not to say that the whole movement, which owed much of its inspiration to Froude, was essentially Pelagian in its view, still less that this applies to Neo-Anglicanism in general. But these unconscious expressions of a naive moralism are religious documents of great interest for the characterisation of a type of piety which is dominated by the idea of spiritual discipline. They show more clearly than most similar documents of later date how this type of piety, when it is not brought to find its limitations by acquaintance with the actual abysses of life and the reality of evil, leads to a kind of doctrine of self-salvation, in which there is properly no room for the message of the Cross. In the Christian gallery of types of piety we might find in this, rather than in the Roman type, the absolute antithesis of Lutheran piety. And though Froude did not Pelagianise Neo-Anglicanism, he is certainly the expression of a line of thought in Anglican religion which was strongly represented both before and after the Oxford Movement.

But justice requires that it should be emphasised how, on the other hand, Pusey brought with him from the Evangelical sphere an intense and tender theology of the Cross, constantly deepened by contact with the classic Passion-mystics of the Church. He knows that 'we cannot hallow ourselves,'[3] that 'the Blood of Christ must ever be our only hope.'[4] He has a profound, at times oppressive, feeling of sin, his preaching of

[1] *Remains*, vol. i. part 2, p. 152. [2] *Ibid.* p. 159.

[3] Even if he adds, 'but we can by His grace put off things unholy' (Pusey, *Sermons during the Season from Advent to Whitsuntide*, p. 44).

[4] *Ibid.* p. 22.

the perfection of the Christian has another depth. He can also speak of 'our perfection,' but only as something potential, by virtue of God's perfect gift, which does not lose its perfection because it is received imperfectly. 'Perfect are we in the purpose of God . . . so we have a sort of relative, or imperfect perfection, in faith, in will, in temper, in love, if we give up ourselves without reserve to receive that perfect gift of God. . . . Thus the way of sanctification and perfection consists in a continuous receiving; this is our perfection in our pilgrimage to recognise our imperfection.'[1] And the feeling of sin leads him constantly afresh to the Cross. 'It would bring but despair to review our sins except at the foot of His Cross . . . deepen thy penitence since thy sin nailed Him there, and thou perhaps hast crucified Him afresh, and wasted thyself the Price of His Blood.'[2] Sometimes he comes nearer to Evangelical confidence than any other of the prophets of Neo-Anglicanism.[3] No doubt he shrinks from thinking out clearly the thought of confidence, but from Evangelicalism he inherited its principles, and in similarly borrowed expression he can let it appear: 'If thou canst see nothing but Hell before thee, shut thine eyes, and cast thyself blindly into the infinite abyss of God's mercy, and the Everlasting Arms will, though thou know it not, receive thee and upbear thee. Hide thee in the Cleft of the Rock riven for thee, thy Saviour's Wounded Side.'[4] There was no need of the echo of Toplady's hymn to show the hall-mark. Especially striking is the contrast between Froude's words quoted above about the impossibility of regaining completely what a man has lost through sin, and Pusey's Augustinian Evangelicalism with its hold on God as the only cause of man's sanctification and salvation: 'Pray Him to draw thee, that thou mayst run after Him. . . .

[1] *Sermons preached in St. Saviour's, Leeds*, pp. 316, 318. It does not diminish the Evangelical content of the last quoted thought that the author supports it by a quotation from Leo the Great: 'this is the true righteousness of the perfect, that they should never presume that they are perfect.'

[2] *Sermons during the Season from Advent to Whitsuntide*, p. 169.

[3] Newman's well-known words: 'What can increase their peace who believe and trust in the Son of God? Shall we add a drop to the ocean, or grains to the sand of the sea?' occur in his first printed sermon of 1825, and thus are from the Evangelical period (*Parochial and Plain Sermons* ('Temporal Advantages') vol. vii. p. 72).

[4] Pusey, *op. cit.* ('Joy out of Suffering') p. 102.

He will give thee " grace for grace," lead thee " from strength to strength." He, if in earnest thou seek Him now, and give thyself wholly to Him, will give thee back all thou hast lost ; the Grace thou hast wasted ; the Love thou hast chilled ; the Purity thou hast stained ; His Spirit which thou hast grieved.'[1] Pusey's ' theologia crucis ' is, perhaps, one of the points where we see most plainly the connection between Evangelicalism and Neo-Anglicanism.

The types of piety so different in their origin which are here described unite in the emphasis laid on the importance of religious discipline. It was Pusey who, by his first contribution to 'Tracts for the Times' (No. 18: ' Thoughts on the Benefit of Fasting enjoined in our Church '), had made observance of the Fast-Days prescribed in the English Prayer Book a central point in the programme of the Oxford school. Thus began a development which is still proceeding : the ascetic element has since then been constantly emphasised more strongly within the borders of Neo-Anglicanism.

The chief object of Pusey's Tract was merely to revive the rules of the Prayer Book on the observance of certain Fast-Days, rules which were generally regarded as antiquated and only exceptionally observed. Now once more the religious importance of fasting was emphasised by one who could testify from his own experience how, in the observance of Fast-Days, he had found protection against himself and the habits of the world. The English Reformers had expunged what was superfluous and vain in fasting rules, but maintained the principle ' to discipline the flesh, to free the spirit, and render it more earnest and fervent to prayer, and as a testimony and

[1] *Op.cit.* p. 170. This passage is followed by the thought of growth, but as a gift of God : ' He in the residue of thy years will accomplish in thee all His work, will form thee to the full stature of His Grace and Love for which He made thee, that thou mayst love Him " with an everlasting love," in overflowing joy and transporting glory, and never-sating, ever-satisfying bliss in Himself, the Fountain of all Bliss and all Good.' Sometimes, however, he seems to reserve God's forgiveness of sins for the judgment ; at least the past, in this life, can never be done away : ' He may, through Christ's Atoning Blood, wash away the past, by repentance ; what he would continually undo, God will, in the end, efface as though never done ; but in this life, it may be, he is not permitted to approve himself wherein he failed. The past stands fixed as adamant, yet to him, as Paradise to Adam, inaccessible ' (*ibid.* (' Irreversible Chastisements ') p. 183).

witness with us before God of our humble submission to His High Majesty.'[1] The Reformers had, however, not determined the manner of keeping the fast, only the days. In their observance is a protection against the enemies of the soul, as in the keeping holy the times of divine service. The Church's rules are also a help to timorous spirits, which would not have been able to make the attempt without them. But the chief object of fasting is not to acquire the habit of self-denial, but its essential aim is to further the life of prayer. The tendency of the age is to activity, and this has left its mark on the spiritual life, nay even coloured our hope of eternity. The desire of activity has taken the place of 'that tranquil retiring meditation on the things of the unseen world, which formed the deep, absorbing, contemplative piety of our forefathers.'[2] A religious repose and a thoughtful contemplation is the chief benefit which fasting produces in the spiritual life. Here we can distinguish the tone of deep, quietistic mysticism which in another connection we shall find as forming an essential constituent in Pusey's piety. 'Fasting, retirement, and prayer, as they severally and unitedly tend to wean us from ourselves and cast us upon God, will tend to promote singleness of purpose, to refine our busy and overheated restlessness into a calm and subdued confidence in Him, in Whose Strength we go forth. Nor shall we, till the Day of Judgment, know how much of the victory was granted to those who in man's sight took no share in the conflict; how far the "unseen strength" of fasting, humiliation, prayer, put forth by those of whom the world took no account, was allowed by God to prevail.'[3]

But fasting should equally give increased opportunities to practise mercy, and it should be a sign of those who really belonged to the Church, in contrast to the children of the world. It should be a protest against the corruption of the world, a witness to men of the reality of the invisible world.

There is no space here to show how fasting and the exercise of self-denial set its mark upon the men of the Oxford

[1] Quotation from the 'Homily on Fasting' (in book of Homilies) in Pusey's Tract, p. 7.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 12.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 13.

school in their individual lives.[1] Pusey himself was probably the most strongly influenced of all. But the most striking example of an attempt to adopt ascetic principles to the details of daily life is given by Froude's well-known Journal, which shows this as early as 1826. The trivial purposes and trivial failures, which are here indicated or confessed, have sometimes been the object of undeserved ridicule. The depth and honesty of purpose must not be measured by the scale of the renunciation imposed. But there is reason to assume that the adaptation of ascetic principles by the Epigoni was marked by a narrow-minded self-importance, which was not unjustly censured (thus not least by Newman himself in 'Loss and Gain'). But though our chief task must be to expound the religious motive of the ascetic principle rather than its application, we must mention first that celibacy to Newman and Froude seems quite early to have stood out as a part of their special vocation,[2] and secondly that the thought of the revival of monasticism in some form appears from the very first. Thus Froude writes in August 1833 that the present situation seems to offer possibilities 'for reviving the monastic system. Certainly Colleges of unmarried priests would be the cheapest way of providing effectively for the spiritual wants of a large population.' It was the same motive, the religious needs of big towns, which impelled Pusey to found the first Neo-Anglican sisterhood. The exaltation of virginity in the early Fathers had also made an impression, especially as it is echoed in some of the High Anglican writers of the seventeenth century (Andrewes, Taylor, and later Law). They could also point to Ferrar's attempt to found a religious community of monastic character at Little Gidding under Charles I.[3] From 1839 onwards Pusey's plans began to take more definite shape, while the impression made by the sisterhoods of France, those of Vincent de Paul and François de Sales, became more definite. It was significant but fateful

[1] Outside the Oxford circle proper the duty of fasting was also inculcated by Manning; see his sermon, 'Fasting a Means to Christian Perfection,' in *Sermons*, vol. ii. p. 4.

[2] Their position as Fellows under the old constitution of the University was in itself calculated to arouse such thoughts. See, *e.g.*, Newman's *Letters and Correspondence*, vol. ii. p. 19 (ed. 1903, p. 17).

[3] Liddon, *Life of Pusey*, vol. iii. p. 2.

that the reintroduction of monasticism should become a direct means of strengthening the influence of modern Roman Catholicism on the Church of England. Though Pusey's own daughter Lucy took the vows before her death in 1844, it was only in the following year that the first recognised sisterhood (in Park Village, Regent's Park) began its activity. Later history has fully justified the plan. That Newman's μονή at Littlemore had a highly conventual stamp can, as was previously pointed out, hardly be denied, in spite of Newman's attempt to explain the matter away, and though its members did not bind themselves by vows. During the last years of uncertainty, when Newman made vain attempts to restrain disciples, who drew out the consequences of his doctrine more quickly than he did himself, he also speaks of a monastery as the only means of keeping people together.[1]

An investigation of the ascetic motive in the preaching of the Oxford Movement is necessary to comprehend its peculiar type of piety and will also contribute to make clear the different influences which here work together. As was to be expected, we find the point of view of religious discipline, the importance of asceticism as a practice in holiness and obedience, strongly emphasised. 'By daily practice in slight crosses of our own will, do we learn the lesson our Lord taught, "Not as I will, but as Thou wilt,"' writes Pusey,[2] and Newman formulates the same thought still more clearly in a sermon on 'The Yoke of Christ' which gives a summary of his ascetic preaching: 'This is the especial object which is set before us, to become holy as He Who has called us is holy, and to discipline and chasten ourselves in order that we may become so'; 'and we may be quite sure, that unless we chasten ourselves, God will chasten us.'[3] The editors of Froude's 'Remains' feel bound to emphasise the fact that the fasts and other external disciplines which take so prominent a place in the confessions of their departed friend, were to him only means to a goal, and combined with 'elevated notions of inward sanctification, of a renewed heart and

[1] 'Men want an outlet for their devotional and penitential feelings, and if we do not grant it, it is a dead certainty they will go where they can find it' (Newman's *Correspondence with Keble and Others*, p. 172).

[2] *Sermons during the Season from Advent to Whitsuntide*, p. 372.

[3] *Parochial and Plain Sermons*, vol. vii. p. 110.

life.'[1] But it was no Pharisaic professional holiness that these men wished to attain. Nothing could be more alien to them than to want to parade their self-discipline. On the contrary, it is precisely the discreet concealment of them that gave the character of a Froude its special charm, that ennobled his little self-denials—their form was perhaps often determined by the fear of their coming under the eyes of others. And in preaching it is above all as a means of purification of the mind and uplifting of the soul that asceticism is valued. So with Newman. 'A smooth and easy life, an uninterrupted enjoyment of the goods of Providence, full meals, soft raiment, well-furnished homes, the pleasures of sense, the feeling of security, the consciousness of wealth—these, and the like, if we are not careful, choke up all the avenues of the soul, through which the light and breath of heaven might come to us. A hard life is, alas, no certain method of becoming spiritually minded, but it is one out of the means by which Almighty God makes us so. We must, at least at seasons, defraud ourselves of nature if we would not be defrauded of grace.' Without such a serious preparation every attempt to force our minds into a pious, loving, and devotional temper leads to falseness and hypocrisy.[2] On another occasion he speaks of renunciations as the Weapons of Saints: 'As health and exercise and regular diet are necessary to strength of the body, so an enfeebling and afflicting of the natural man, a chastising and afflicting of soul and body are necessary to the exaltation of the soul.'[3] And Prayer and Fasting are the 'wings of the soul,' without which it cannot take its heavenward road.[4]

All Christian asceticism must obtain its proper nourishment and seek its deepest justification in the contemplation of the suffering Saviour. This applies to the ascetic preaching of the Oxford Movement. Yet there seems to prevail a peculiar difference as to the degree of intensity with which the thought of Christ's Cross as the original type of all the

[1] *Remains*, vol. i. part 1, preface, p. xvi.

[2] *Parochial and Plain Sermons* ('Love the One Thing Needful'), vol. v. No. 23, p. 337.

[3] *Ibid.* vol. vi. p. 322.

[4] *Ibid.* ('Rising with Christ') vol. vi. No. 15, p. 208. This must not be regarded as aiming at an ecstatic state: anything of the kind was alien to the sober character of the Oxford school.

renunciations of His followers is brought out. It is true that Newman again and again directs the thoughts of his hearers to the Crucified, and he can represent the contemplation of Christ's sufferings as the greatest help to growth in holiness.[1] But the thought of the Cross in this connection has with him little more than the character of a theological *locus communis*. It is far more interesting to see how there springs up in another of the leaders an intense Cross mysticism, deriving food and imagery from the piety of antiquity as well as from that of St. Bernard. But that Newman was not quite strange to this is shown by such a passage as the following: 'This is what it is to be one of Christ's little ones—to have that within us through which we can do all things; to be possessed by His Presence as our life, our strength, our merit, our hope, our crown; to become in a wonderful way His members, the instruments, or visible form, or sacramental sign, of the One Invisible Ever-Present Son of God, mystically reiterating in each of us all the acts of His earthly life, His Birth, consecration, fasting, temptation, conflicts, victories, sufferings, agony, passion, death, resurrection and ascension.'[2]

But the connection between the suffering of Christ and the renunciations of the individual Christian come in here only as a part of a great mystical scheme. As we have already seen, it is with Pusey and under his influence that the intensive theology and mysticism of the Cross first makes its appearance in Neo-Anglicanism. Passages in which he speaks of the Blood of Christ as the only hope of Christians and of the sin-effacing power of the Blood might be quoted *ad infinitum*. That this theology of Cross and Blood is at the outset of Evangelical origin, has seemed probable to us. It had certainly also been affected by similar ideas in German Pietism, to which Pusey devoted a thorough and sympathetic study.[3] But it soon

[1] *Parochial and Plain Sermons* ('Love the One Thing Needful') vol. v. No. 23; *ibid.* ('Christ's Privations a Meditation for Christians') vol. vi. No. 4, p. 43.

[2] The continuation passes into the mystic world of sacramental ideas, to which this passage properly belongs: 'He being all in all,—we with as little power in ourselves, as little excellence or merit, as the water in Baptism, or the bread and wine in Holy Communion, yet strong in the Lord, and in the Power of His might' (*ibid.* ('Fasting a Source of Trial') vol. vi. No. 1, p. 3).

[3] This applies specially to the Halle Pietists. See Pusey, *An Historical Enquiry into the Probable Causes of the Rationalist Character lately predominant in the Theology of Germany* (London, 1818), pp. 67–108.

obtained fresh food and greater depth from his patristic studies. The bridge, by which he passed from his earlier standpoint to the full acceptance of the mysticism of the Greek Fathers, which is found in his later standpoint, was St. Augustine. It would be a probable assumption, even if it were not made fully clear by the quotations and notes with which Pusey interlards his sermons, which thereby assume the character of small essays. St. Augustine's importance for the Oxford Movement could scarcely be exaggerated, but has hitherto hardly received due notice. In their time were added influences both from mediaeval Passion mysticism and from certain tendencies in modern Catholicism.[1]

The typically Augustinian thought, which we find bearing fruit in Pusey, is the thought of *Christus humilis*; the self-humiliation of Christ, whereby He exchanged *forma Domini* for *forma servi*, as the real content of the Incarnation, and also the prototype and pattern of all human self-denial. A sermon, from which we have already quoted exuberant expressions about the marvel of the Incarnation, is dominated by the conception of *Christus humilis*, which gave it its title.[2] 'One had not dared so to speak of His Ineffable Humility, lest we, so little humble, should not be able with reverence to think on His Humility, had they not of old, in more reverent days, so spoken'; and we are informed in the note that St. Augustine is referred to in the first instance.[3] From him he borrows the phrase: 'So deeply had human pride sunk us, that nothing but Divine Humility could raise us.'[4] But this borrowed motive of humility is not mechanically reproduced without becoming living and active afresh. 'Our Lord, from the manger, where for our sakes He deigned to lie, preacheth to us humility.' So it was in all His life and sufferings, and He sums up His teaching in a symbolic action, when He washes the disciples' feet. All this inculcates the self-denial, though it be only in small things, which is characteristic of the Tractarian asceti-

[1] Specially illuminating for this development, and also for the connection with Evangelicalism, is Pusey's preface (dated 1844) to the English version of F. Surin, *The Foundations of the Spiritual Life*.

[2] 'The Incarnation, a Lesson of Humility' (*Sermons from Advent to Whitsuntide*).

[3] *Ibid.* p. 66.

[4] 'Tantum te pressit humana superbia, ut te non posset nisi humilitas sublevare divina' (Sermon No. 188, p. 3 (vol. v. p. 1004 in Migne); cp. Loofs, *Leitfaden zum Studium der Dogmengeschichte* (4th ed., Halle, 1906), p. 395).

cism. 'If thou must outwardly be honoured and served, inwardly abase thyself as unworthy; if praised, call quick to mind the ill thou knowest of thyself, and others know not of. . . . Be not over anxious to clear thyself from blame; all blame is deserved, if not at man's hand, yet at God's; in undeserved blame see . . . what but for God's Grace thou wouldest even now be; in praise, what by God's Grace we should have been, but, through our sin, are not; confess habitually to God the sins of thy youth, thy many shortcomings, thy daily infirmities; consider with thyself what God is, and what thou; He, how pure! thou, in thyself, nothing; of thyself but sin; pray to see thy sins, as God seeth them; so, striking "root downwards"[1] in humility, shalt thou bear "fruit upwards" unto God.'[2] But on the Cross God's self-humiliation in the Incarnation is perfected. 'Self-denying, self-emptying charity, is the faint shadow of that love which brought Him down from the Bosom of the Father, clothed Him with the form of a Servant, to save us sinners. It is in a manner to be as He was. His Cross hallows it; His Cross preaches it; His Cross sustains it; His Cross rewards it.'[3]

The thought of how the Cross and the suffering Saviour are mirrored and are present in every act of self-denial in His followers, is perhaps best expressed by Isaac Williams in a sermon at St. Saviour's, Leeds, after its consecration in 1845, probably in its entirety the strongest expression of the teaching of the Cross by the Oxford school.[4] 'The mystery

[1] Again an echo of St. Augustine (Sermon No. 69). [2] *Op. cit.* p. 72.

[3] *Op. cit.* p. 33; cp. Manning's sermon, 'The Spiritual Cross' (*Sermons*, vol. i. No. 18, p. 270).

[4] 'Virtue of the Cross through Love' (*Sermons preached in St. Saviour's Church, Leeds*, p. 161). Like the rest of the series it is strongly under Pusey's influence (Pusey delivered several of the sermons which others wrote for the occasion, and in some cases added a conclusion of his own, according to preface, p. 3). But Williams has a simple clearness of expression of which Pusey was never capable. The following passage deserves quotation for the beauty of the thought and expression: 'What does decay and death and sickness, and "the whole creation groaning and travailing in pain together" teach us but the Cross? But in decay of autumn and in setting suns, and in pains of all suffering creation, and in sick-beds and death, the Cross is blended with loving-kindness, with gleams of beauty, and consolations and peaceful hopes. . . . No calm and peace is so exquisite as that which is connected with sickness and affliction; so that the meanest flower after the sick-room is, says the poet, as an "opening Paradise." For Gethsemane has become to us now in the place of Eden.'

of the Cross hath passed into every duty. . . . Every duty is a denial of self, and therefore a bearing of the Cross, and as the Image of Christ Crucified passes into all things that are His—like the Sun in the Heavens infinitely multiplying itself in all things, even the most insignificant, on which it looks—so does this great law pass into all Christian duties, even the smallest of daily occurrence. If painful—yet because they are painful, are they all the more connected with peace and hope. . . . Rise early to prayer, and it may be that it is an hour that has pain, but it has sweetness also, for it has the image of the Cross upon it, the pain of the reluctant flesh and sweetness of Divine Love ; it has the Cross upon it, and therefore as such, it goes forward and is stored in Heaven. Fastings and alms are acceptable offerings, but not unless they have the Cross stamped upon them. . . . This is the rendering unto God of the things that are His in this evil world ; whatever bears the image and superscription of our King as reigning below upon His Cross, these the Father treasures in the royal treasuries of His Kingdom against the hour of our great need.'[1]

Together with this deeply religious orientation on the Cross as the type and chief motive of all self-denial, there enters into the Oxford Movement another line, scarcely less important for the characterisation of its special nature. It does not, like the former, lead to the real heights of spiritual life, yet a special parallelism seems to prevail between the two. This other line, which is as peculiar to Newman as the former to Pusey, seems to have its origin in Calvinistic Evangelicalism, and probably gained fresh strength by contact with St. Augustine. But the bridge in this case is not devotion to

[1] Williams, *op. cit.* p. 163 ; cp. Pusey, *op. cit.* p. 152 : ' The Cross of Christ changes all it touches. It brought in life for death, holiness for sin. . . . It makes weakness strength ; sorrow joy ; fasting a feast . . . petty self-denials Angelic crowns.' Cp. also *Sermons preached in St. Saviour's Church, Leeds*, p. 341. Very instructive for Pusey's theology of the Cross is his sermon, ' The Cross borne for Us and in Us,' in *Plain Sermons by Contributors to the Tracts for the Times* (London, 1841), vol. iii. No. 73 (see especially p. 15) : ' Think nothing too little, seek for the Cross in the daily incidents of life ; look for the Cross in everything. Nothing is little which relates to man's salvation ; nor is there anything too little in which either to please God or serve Satan. Therefore it is that the Cross so often meets our eyes in common things, yea, that it is the commonest thing in art and nature.' (He sees the Cross in the human form, the flight of birds, the masts of a ship, in windows and doors, the soldier's sword, etc.)

the Cross and the suffering Saviour, but the idea of Predestination. This perhaps was seldom fully conscious and clear; it appears combined with the motive of the Cross and the thought of the imitation of the suffering Saviour. But it, or the religious temper of which it is the expression, is plainly behind a series of passages, in which Newman speaks of self-denial, of serious observation of religious duties, as a sign that one belongs to the company of the elect.

In the early Church a sharp line was drawn between the Church and the world. Now that good and evil are mixed together, and the world has entered the doors of the Church, we have to show our devotion to Christ 'not in great matters, not in giving up house and lands for His sake, but in making little sacrifices, which the world would ridicule if it knew of them.'[1] It is in all these apparently trivial matters that a man shows himself to be 'a vessel of grace or of wrath.' These small self-denials become a standing reminder of the great difference, the ineffaceable line, drawn between the true Christian and the world. 'Never allow yourselves, my brethren, to fancy that the true Christian character can coalesce with this world's character, or is the world's character improved—merely a superior kind of worldly character.'[2] To many religion is a refined worldliness: 'But if you have thought it was nothing more than this, if you have neglected to stir up the great gift of God which is lodged deep within you, the gift of election and regeneration, if you have been scanty in your devotions, in intercession, prayer, and praise, and if in consequence you have little or nothing of the sweetness, the winning grace, the innocence, the freshness, the tenderness, the cheerfulness, the composure of the elect of God, if you are at present really deficient in praying, and other divine exercises, make a new beginning henceforth.'[3] How it is as a pledge of election, a sign that one is set in the narrow way, that self-denial gets its special value, appears in the conclusion of a recently quoted sermon on 'The Yoke of Christ': 'If Almighty God moves any of us, so that we have high thoughts; if from reading

[1] *Parochial and Plain Sermons* ('Contrast between Truth and Falsehood in the Church'), vol. iii. No. 15, p. 210.
[2] *Ibid.* ('The Yoke of Christ') vol. vii. No. 8, p. 113.
[3] *Ibid.* ('Rising with Christ') vol. vi. No. 15, p. 219.

Scripture or holy books we find that we can embrace views above the world; if it is given us to recognise the glory of Christ's Kingdom, to discern its spiritual nature, to admire the life of saints, and to desire to imitate it; if we feel and understand that it is good to bear the yoke in our youth, good to be in trouble, good to be poor, good to be in low estate, good to be despised; if in imagination we put ourselves at the feet of those mortified men of old times who, after St. Paul's pattern, died daily, and knew no one after the flesh: if we feel all this, and are conscious we feel it, let us not boast—why? because of a surety such feelings are a pledge to us that God will in some way or other give them exercise. . . . My brothers, count the cost; never does God give faith but He tries it; never does He implant the wish to sit on His right hand and on His left, but He fulfils it by making us wash our brethren's feet.'[1]

We have, however, plainer witness that the idea of predestination was an important factor in Newman's personal religion, and that his ascetic teaching is in close connection with this idea. We may first recall how his earliest religious crisis[2] implanted in him the conviction that he himself was predestined to salvation and *perseverantia*. This conviction, however, had not made him careless about pleasing God, and after his twenty-first year had gradually faded away, though it had a certain influence on his later development.[3] His belief in his own predestination had not included the belief in the preordaining of others to eternal death.[4] This doctrine had also been definitely rejected by Thomas Scott. Further, Newman declares that the only Calvinistic doctrine which firmly took root in his mind was the doctrine of the radical opposition

[1] *Parochial and Plain Sermons*, vol. vii. p. 116.

[2] *Apologia*, p. 58 (ed. 1864; 1908, p. 4).

[3] 'In isolating me from the objects which surrounded me, in confirming me in my mistrust of the reality of material phenomena, and making me rest in the thought of two, and two only, supreme and luminously self-evident beings, myself and my Creator.'

[4] The Fathers of the Birmingham Oratory, who published *Correspondence of Newman with Keble and Others*, and who generally try to explain away as far as possible all that points to Calvinistic influence on Newman, declare that the Calvinistic doctrine of predestination certainly was not one of those which he made his own (p. 116), but this assumption seems inconsistent with the passage quoted from *Apologia* and passages from sermons which will presently be quoted.

between the world of good and that of evil, while the doctrines of *perseverantia* and of the elect's certainty of their regenerate state were irreconcilable with the Catholic Faith. But he does not expressly reject the thought of an absolute predestination to salvation. Apart from the fact that we may assume *a priori* that Newman at sixty-three years of age was inclined to underestimate the influence of Calvinism on his earlier development, there seems to be unambiguous proof that the idea of predestination meant far more for his Anglican period than the testimony of 'Apologia' shows. Even in 1837 he seems to be occupied with the idea of *praedestinatio ad mortem*, though contradictory expressions occur.[1]

There is a close connection between the idea of predestination and the position so often inculcated in Newman's teaching about the narrow way and the few who walk therein, in contrast with the broad way which the many follow. It is by no means a unique occurrence in the history of Christian Ethics that this idea has become the strongest motive to moral action, though it perhaps more often took the shape of active life than of asceticism. 'I am suspicious of any religion that is a people's religion, or an age's religion,' comes from a sermon of 1833, 'Self-denial the Test of Religious Earnestness.'[2] There must be something even now that separates the Christian from the multitude, and that is the self-denial taught us by the Saviour's words: 'that a rigorous self-denial is a chief duty, nay, that it may be considered the test whether we are Christ's disciples, whether we are living in a mere dream, which we mistake for Christian Faith and obedience, or are really and truly awake, alive, living in the day, on our road heavenwards.'[3] If our life does not give unsought opportunities to practise

[1] *Parochial and Plain Sermons* ('Chastisement amid Mercy'), vol. iv. No. 13, p. 101: 'Few persons, comparatively speaking, would maintain that a man once in a state of grace cannot fall away; now here, in like manner, it might be asked how can God at present love one whom He has appointed to everlasting punishment?' This seems to deny the doctrine of *perseverantia*, but assumes that of *praedestinatio ad mortem*. A month later, in a sermon especially important for this theme, 'Many called, Few chosen' (*ibid.* vol. v. No. 18, p. 258), he writes: 'His mercy is over all His works, and to no one does the word of life come but with the intent that he may live.'

[2] *Ibid.* vol. i. No. 5, p. 61.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 66; cp. Manning, *Sermons* (7th ed., London, 1848), vol. i. No. 7 ('A Severe Life necessary for Christ's Followers'), p. 90.

self-denial, 'it is right almost to find out for yourself daily self-denials.' 'Try yourself daily in little deeds, to prove that your faith is more than a deceit.' That in this another thought lies behind that of mere self-discipline, and that self-denials have their greatest value not as a sign of a subjective condition, but as the seal of election, is made plain by the explicit treatment of the theme 'Many called, Few chosen,' four years later.[1]

In this sermon we have the most thorough explanation of the problem of predestination in Newman's teaching. He takes up the objections to the idea that it must breed indifference and self-security: it can only do this in combination with the doctrine of the individual's assurance of salvation;[2] and the absolute denial of this doctrine is one of the corner-stones in his Anglican theology. Without that, the thought of the fewness of the elect merely incites to more zealous running the course set before us. To an outside observer there seem to be everywhere so many men with good sides, that he would rather believe that the elect are many. But this shows that God must measure by a different standard from that of the world. 'It shows you that if the chosen are few, there must be some particular belief necessary, or some particular line of conduct, or something else different from what the world supposes, in order to account for this solemn declaration. It suggests to you that perchance there must be a certain perfection, completeness, consistency, entireness of obedience, for a man to be chosen, which most men miss in one point or another. It suggests to you that there is a great difference between being a hearer of the word and a doer; a well-wisher of the truth, or an approver of good men or good actions, and a faithful servant of the Truth. It suggests to you that it is one thing to be in earnest, another and higher to be "rooted and grounded in love." It suggests to you the exceeding dangerousness of single sins, or particular

[1] *Parochial and Plain Sermons*, vol. v. No. 18. So in Manning, *Sermons* (2nd ed., London, 1850), vol. iv. No. 19, p. 334: 'By what then shall we discern the life of our election? Not by any external signs, nor by any supernatural intimations, nor by resting upon absolute decrees and the like; but only the deep inward marks of the work of God in us, by the correspondence of our spirit with the will and working of the Spirit of God.'

[2] *Ibid.* vol. v. No. 18, p. 258.

bad habits. It suggests to you the peril of riches, cares of this life, station and credit.'[1]

This passage definitely builds a bridge between the thought of election and the requirement of ascetic perfection. Here, as everywhere, where ideas of predestination play a part, it is difficult to settle their exact bearing. Should we be right in considering this as one of the elements which determined the temper of the Oxford Movement and partly of all Neo-Anglicanism? Should the idea of predestination combined with the denial of the possibility of security—this doctrine we shall have occasion to discuss later in the study of Newman's doctrine of Justification—should these together have contributed to shape this *Via Media* of the religious temperament between the Lutheran confidence in God's promise accepted by faith, and the Roman security in the *barca di San Pietro*? The characteristic feature of this *Via Media* then would be, not a certain Church theory, but a feeling of unrest, an anxious striving after a maximum as the best possible guarantee for the election of its possessor—a maximum of holiness of living and self-sacrifice, a maximum of doctrine in mystical response to a maximum of life; and we have already dimly seen, and shall soon see further, how behind the static view of the Church are concealed the dispositions to another, the chief motive of which is the endeavour to secure as much as possible of 'the mantle which the Lord let fall from His shoulders when He left the earth,' a maximum of Catholicity as regards Church order.

The scantiness of the material hardly permits us to build too much upon this combination. But the lines of thought sketched here, in any case, form a wonderfully suggestive background to the anxious precision, the fear of every excess of joy or confidence, the trait of Puritanical severity which at times seems to form the fundamental tone of the Tractarian temper.[2] Specially during the fighting mood of the early years, Newman

[1] *Parochial and Plain Sermons*, p. 267; cp. a sermon of 1840 on 'The Visible Temple': 'Fine dresses, fine houses, fine furniture, fine establishments are painful to the true Christian; they create misgivings in his mind whether his portion is with the Saints or with the world' (*ibid.* vol. vi. No. 20, p. 293). For the connection between predestination and asceticism see E. Troeltsch, *Die Soziallehren der christlichen Kirchen und Gruppen* (Tübingen, 1919), p. 212.

[2] 'There is no safety, brethren, but never to think ourselves safe' (Pusey, *Sermons during the Season from Advent to Whitsuntide*, p. 212).

puts forward the hard-handed zeal of Old Testament history as a pattern,[1] and he expresses a wish that he saw 'any prospect of this element of zeal and holy sternness springing up among us, to temper and give character to the languid, unmeaning benevolence which we mis-name Christian love. I have no hope of my country till I see it. Many schools of Religion and ethics are to be found among us, and they all profess to magnify, in one shape or another, what they consider the principle of love; but what they lack is a firm maintenance of that characteristic of the Divine Nature which, in accommodation to our infirmity, is named by St. John and his brethren the wrath of God'—in contrast with those who make religion a matter of feeling, who consider 'that the vision of revealed love works a moral change in them spontaneously; in either case dispensing with all laborious efforts, all "fear and trembling," all self-denial in "working out their salvation," nay looking upon such qualifications with suspicion as leading to a supposed self-confidence and spiritual pride.'[2]

Later when joy in God, the temper of religious festivity, asserts itself, it combines with this trait of holy trembling and terror into a twilight of feeling. Only if we live a self-denying life, if we have 'a subdued tone of thought and feeling,' is it allowable to speak of the high mysteries of the faith.[3] Therefore fast and festival go together. 'Our festivals are preceded by humiliation, that we may keep them duly; not boisterously or fanatically, but in a refined, subdued, "chastised" spirit, which is the true rejoicing in the Lord.'[4] And when he sees the danger, that the men of the next generation will make too much of externals, and aim at a false religious enjoyment, he preaches at the end of his Anglican career on 'the severe

[1] Cp. R. H. Hutton, *Cardinal Newman*, p. 52.

[2] *Parochial and Plain Sermons* ('Tolerance of Religious Error'), vol. ii. No. 23, p. 286; cp. p. 289.

[3] *Ibid.* vol. vi. No. 6, p. 67. It is this temper which lies behind the thought of 'religious reserve' which Isaac Williams expounds in his Tracts so undeservedly howled down, Nos. 80 and 87, 'On Reserve in Communicating Religious Knowledge.'

[4] In an Easter sermon, 'Keeping Fast and Festival,' *Parochial and Plain Sermons*, vol. iv. No. 23, p. 339; cp. *ibid.* ('Equanimity') vol. v. No. 6, p. 66: 'The duty of fearing does but perfect our joy; that joy alone is true Christian joy, which is informed and quickened by fear, and made thereby sober and reverent.'

side of religion,' of the duty of uniting 'beauty with severity,' of not forgetting the garb of holy fear at the spiritual feast.[1]

This temper of subdued, chastened, trembling joy, this spiritual bashfulness with its unmistakable stamp of academic temperament, perhaps does not belong to the strongest sides of the Oxford Movement viewed as purely religious. But it is a noble hall-mark, which does not in like measure stamp all the pages in the history of Neo-Anglicanism. An expression for this temper, embodied in a departed friend, was found by the editors of Froude's 'Remains,' when on the title-page they placed the following lines from the Paris Breviary :

> 'Se sub serenis vultibus
> Austera virtus occulit
> Timens videri, ne suum,
> Dum prodit, amittat decus.'

[1] *Sermons on Subjects of the Day* ('Indulgence in Religious Privileges'), No. 9, pp. 120, 122. But Newman can also preach joy as a Christian duty : 'Gloom is no Christian temper; that repentance is not real which has not love in it ; that self-chastisement is not acceptable which is not sweetened by faith and cheerfulness.' We must live in sunshine even when we sorrow ; we must live in God's presence' (*Parochial and Plain Sermons*, 'Present Blessings'), vol. v. No. 19, p. 271). The most concentrated expression of this requirement of a chastened joy is found in the description of the mind of hidden saints in the poem, 'The True Elect' :

> 'Meekness, love, patience, faith's serene repose ;
> And the soul's tutored mirth,
> Bidding the slow heart dance, to prove her power
> O'er self in its proud hour.'
>
> *Lyra Apostolica*, No. 55.

Cp. also Pusey in *Plain Sermons*, vol. iii. No. 90, p. 279 : 'Mirth is not joy . . . all joy is adulterous joy which joys in aught without Him' ; p. 282 : 'Joy is the very Presence of God the Comforter within the soul knitting it to God.'

## CHAPTER XIII

### THE PROGRESSIVE IDEA OF THE CHURCH

It has already been shown how the inner history of the Oxford Movement is essentially determined by tension between a static and a progressive, dynamic principle. Even a sketch of the static conception, which was built up with Apostolic Succession as the corner-stone, and after the supposed ground-plan of the early Church, showed us signs that the new wine of religious awakening threatened to burst the old bottles. The analysis of the special nature of this religious awakening has made clear that its strongest driving force was the longing for holiness, and that this gradually in a peculiar way seems to unite with views that grew up in the region of the idea of predestination. The intimate connection between these two will become more plain as we go on to study their effect on the concept of the Church, especially in Newman: *the true Elect* are God's Saints—to say, that the true Church is the body of the elect, is only another expression for the idea that holiness is the most essential note of the Church. But between a conception of the Church which proceeds from this way of thinking, and that which is constructed on a purely historical foundation and with the ministry of the Church as the most essential criterion, there is a dualism which can never be entirely overcome. There is nearly the same antithesis between the empirical and the purely spiritual conception of the Church which is at the bottom of St. Augustine's view.[1] The analogy is so striking that exactly this antithesis between two fundamentally inconsistent views of the Church is one of

[1] Cp. Harnack, *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte* (4th ed.), vol. iii. p. 164; Loofs, *Leitfaden zum Studium der Dogmengeschichte*, p. 377. The chief passage in St. Augustine is *De Bapt.* v. 30.

the points in which the dependence of the Oxford Movement on St. Augustine appears most plainly. How this dualism appears in Newman's teaching, and how he attempts to reconcile the antithesis, it is our next task to show.

'There are in every age a certain number of souls in the world, known to God, unknown to us, who will obey the Truth when offered to them, whatever be the mysterious reason that they do and others do not. These we must contemplate, for these we must labour, these are God's special care, for these are all things; of these and among these we must pray to be, and our friends with us, at the Last Day. They are the true Church, ever increasing in number, ever gathering in, as time goes on; with them lies the Communion of Saints; they have power with God; they are His armies who follow the Lamb, who overcome princes of the earth, and who shall hereafter judge Angels.'[1]

It need not be pointed out how here we are in a quite different spiritual atmosphere from the polemical inculcation in the early Tracts of *successio apostolica* as the proper guarantee of salvation; and yet these words were written in 1836. The idea of a fore-ordaining—for this is at the bottom, though the writer is inclined only to speak of fore-knowledge—explains why the Church has never succeeded in converting all nations: 'Success in the hearts of the many is not promised her.' In spite of the general educating influence of the Church on the life of the people, there has really been little alteration. 'The state of great cities now is not so very different to what it was of old.' But the Church's task was not 'to turn the whole earth into a heaven, but to bring down a heaven upon earth. This has been the real triumph of the Gospel, to raise those beyond themselves and beyond human nature, in whatever rank and condition of life, whose wills mysteriously co-operate with God's Grace, who, while God visits them, really fear, and really obey God, whatever be the unknown reason why one man obeys Him and another not. It has made men saints, and brought into existence specimens of faith and holiness, which without it are unknown and impossible. It has laboured for the elect, and it has

[1] *Parochial and Plain Sermons* ('The Visible Church for the Sake of the Elect'), vol. iv. No. 18, p. 153.

succeeded with them. This is, as it were, its token. An ordinary kind of religion, praiseworthy and respectable in its way, may exist under many systems; but saints are creations of the Gospel and the Church.'[1] To breed saints, to discover and develop the elect is thus the proper task of the visible Church; 'to elicit, foster, mature the seeds of heaven which lie hid in the earth, to multiply (if it may be said) images of Christ, which though they be few, are worth all else that is among men.'[2] 'The Gospel, then, has come to us, not merely to make us good subjects, good citizens, good members of society,' to develop and perfect the natural in us, 'but to make us members of the New Jerusalem. . . . Certainly no one is a true Christian who is not a good subject and member of society; but neither is he a true Christian, if he is nothing more than this. If he is not aiming at something beyond the power of the natural man, he is not really a Christian, or one of the elect.'[3] Again we discern how the restless straining after signs of the election of the individual works as an impulse of sanctification.

That this is not an unjustified pressing of isolated phrases, but that we really have to trace a deep-seated factor in the whole development we are examining, results from a comparative study of Manning's teaching, which though independent in its development proceeds from the same roots as Newman's. In him at times more clearly than in Newman it comes out how powerfully the idea of predestination contributes to place in the seat of honour the conception of holiness and the requirement of sanctification. This has already been shown with reference to Manning's sermon on 'The Sealing of the Elect.' This sermon, based on Rev. vii. 2, 3, and in consequence moving in apocalyptic imagery, propounds the question: how can we examine ourselves, whether we belong to the number of the elect who were sealed by the Angel of the Lord? The answer is, first: 'What is our character? This very word which we so habitually use, signifies a stamp impressed upon our spiritual nature. It is the counterpart of sealing. And we use it to signify the whole outline of our moral being.' Do we desire God's Love or not? Does sin excite sorrow in us, is the mere thought of

[1] *Parochial and Plain Sermons*, p. 156.
[2] *Ibid.* p. 159.
[3] *Ibid.* p. 161.

holiness a joy ? Do we live for this or the next world ? Do we follow ' the majority of Christians or the company of saints, the plausible and pleasant religion of social life or the severe and lonely spirit of the Cross ? '[1] Or are we at least on the way to such a character, are we striving after it ? The sermon concludes in a tone of hopeful warning ; it is the best self of a sincere man that speaks and impels him in his better moments. No doubt he falls back from these heights of life, which are gifts from above. But we must try to keep them for ever longer periods. ' Quicken and strengthen these desires by a life of prayer, by meditation, by habitual communion, by self-examination, by confession ; by exercises of the heart, and by acts of faith, hope, and love. A soul united to God is endowed with the gift of perseverance ; a will restored to its true freedom, hating sin and delighting in the presence of Christ, shall be steadfast eternally ; a heart kindled by the Holy Spirit is " sealed unto the day of redemption." '[2]

If one holds fast to this connection between the belief in election and personal sanctification, it becomes natural that the thought of the Church as the body of the elect should become another form of the conception which makes holiness the chief note of the Church and sanctification its object. This appears with all the plainness that can be desired in another of Manning's sermons, ' The Waiting of the Invisible Church.'[3] He also deals with the same contrast between the invisible and the visible Church, which we have seen indicated in Newman, and sometimes talks of the soul and body of the Church.[4]

Everything is predetermined and foreseen by God, the day of Judgment (Rev. vii. 9–11 is the text) and all that must happen beforehand. ' He has shadowed out to us the nature of the work that He has to do before the end come ; that is, to make up a certain number whom God has foreseen and predestinated to life eternal.' This is the inmost meaning of the whole history of the world ; all is merely to try and perfect God's elect, this holy fellowship which ' is not

[1] H. E. Manning, *Sermons*, vol. iv. (2nd ed., London, 1850), p. 334.

[2] *Ibid.* pp. 339 f. [3] *Ibid.* vol. i. (7th ed., London, 1848), pp. 334–348.

[4] While still an Anglican, Manning expresses his idea of the visible and the invisible Church and their mutual relations most clearly in the book *The Unity of the Church* (London, 1842), *e.g.* pp. 355, 367.

more perfect in the integrity of its number, than in its absolute perfection of holiness.' 'Many partake of the visible unity who in the invisible have no portion. The Church is like a sacrament, having both its outward and inward parts. The true Church has both a body and a soul: the body is that one, uniform, organised, universal polity, of which the succession of the Apostles is the essential first condition: the soul is that inward unity of energetic faith, hope, and charity, which knits all saints, from the highest to the lowest, in one spiritual family. These are the fruits, or result, of the visible unity; as the likeness of Christ is the effect of the holy sacrament in the faithful receiver. The visible unity is a sacramental means to the formation of this fellowship of sanctity. All regenerated men are saints in capability, but these are saints in fact. The former may be, the latter *are* conformed to Christ's likeness. The difference is the same as between a moral nature and a moral habit: the nature may be passive, or be perverted; the habit must be developed by energy and sustained by the power of a moral life. There is therefore no difficulty in testing ourselves. Every man can tell whether his life is energetically pure and holy or not. . . . The sure sign is the likeness of Christ growing in our hearts, waxing ever brighter from childhood, in boyhood, youth, and riper years: ever shining out more clearly as He draws nearer.' More plainly the motive force of these thoughts cannot be brought out.

If we return to Newman, we find the contrast between the Church, as the body of saints, and the empirical institution most clearly expressed in a Whitsuntide Sermon of 1837 on 'The Communion of Saints.' Here the idea of predestination is clearly expressed. 'The Church, then, properly considered, is the great company of the elect, which has been separated by God's free grace, and His Spirit working in due season, from this sinful world, regenerated and vouchsafed perseverance unto life eternal.[1] Viewed so far as it merely consists of persons *now* living in this world, it is of course a visible company; but in its nobler and truer character it is a body invisible, or nearly so, as being made up, not merely of the few who happen still to be on their trial, but of the many

[1] This phrase seems to conflict with and go further than Newman's other utterances on election.

who sleep in the Lord.'[1] This is the invisible Church, which is truly Christ's mystical Body, and the temple wherein He dwells. 'He dwells in the hearts of His Saints, in that temple of living stones, on earth and in heaven, which is ever showing the glory of His kingdom, and talking of His power; but since faith and love and joy and peace cannot be seen, since the company of His people are His secret ones, He has given us something outward as a guide to what is inward, something visible as a guide to what is spiritual.' It is the Christian ministry which guides us to the Holy of Holies. 'As landmarks or buoys inform the steersman, as the shadow on the dial is an index of the sun's course; so, if we would cross the path of Christ, if we would arrest His eye, and engage His attention . . . we must join ourselves to that Ministry'—here follows the previously quoted image of the mantle, which the Lord let drop from His shoulders, as did Elijah of old.[2] It is the now living generation of the Apostles' successors with the other ministers of the Church and the 'Christians depending on them' that we call the Church, though really it is only the now visible part of the great invisible Church. This spiritual Church is only spiritually present on earth, and therefore not limited by space and time, 'the heavenly Jerusalem, the mother of our new birth, is in all lands at once, fully and entirely as a spirit; in the East and in the West, in the North and in the South, that is, wherever her outward instruments are to be found. The Ministry and Sacraments, and bodily presence of Bishop and people, are given as keys and spells by which we bring ourselves into the presence of the great company of saints; they are as much as this, but they are no more; they are not identical with that company; they are but the outskirts of it; they are but porches to the Pool of Bethesda, entrance into that which is indivisible and one.'[3]

The duality in the idea of the visible Church, and its relation to the invisible, which we find here, is certainly not fully present to the writer's mind. How can the visible Church at once be that part of the invisible which is now living upon earth and its crystallisation in the form of time but entirely in possession of its spiritual privileges, and at

[1] *Parochial and Plain Sermons*, vol. iv. No. 11, p. 172.
[2] *Ibid.* pp. 173 f.
[3] *Ibid.* pp. 175 f.

the same time the porch which leads to the company of saints beyond all limitation of time? And behind this is another obscurity, the unproved assumption, which has often become axiomatic in the history of Neo-Anglicanism, that it is only within the limits of the institutional, 'true' Church, that real saints are to be found. That Newman to some extent felt these difficulties is shown by an earlier sermon (1835) on 'The Church Visible and Invisible,'[1] in which he argues against the view, that one might speak of two different Churches. Scripture knows only of one Church, a visible body invested with invisible privileges. 'It is allowable to speak of the Visible and Invisible Church, as two sides of one and the same thing.'[2] That individual members of the visible Church have abandoned their participation in its privileges, does not mean that the body, as such, has lost them. The other obvious objection that the occurrence of good men outside the visible Church necessitates the assumption of an invisible Church, is refuted by a sophistical rejoinder, of ambiguous character: only he who is regenerate by Baptism can be a member of the Church, and 'no outward conduct, however consistent, can be a criterion, to our mortal judgments, of this unearthly and mysterious privilege.'[3]

Apart from the question of regeneration in Baptism, which when this was written was in the forefront of theological discussion, it does not agree with the theory of Apostolic Succession as the criterion of the true Church to make it comprehend all the baptized, since according to the final decision of the early Church the baptism of heretics was also valid. This seems in effect to be one of the fundamental contradictions of the static theory of the Church.

But it is not our object here to point out dialectical contradictions, but to notice how the antithesis between the static institutional view of the Church, and the idea of the Church as the body of the elect, the 'saints,' comes out more strongly, at times even in the unsuccessful attempts to conceal it, and how this antithesis is really the expression of the

[1] *Parochial and Plain Sermons*, vol. iii. No. 16. [2] *Ibid.* p. 221.

[3] Pp. 230 f.: 'Therefore, when you bring to me the case of religious Dissenters, I rejoice at hearing of them. If they know no better, God, I trust, will accept them as He did the Shunammite.'

bursting of cobwebs of Church theories by purely religious factors. Even in the sermon of 1837, on 'The Communion of Saints,' quoted above, one can distinguish how the emphasis is shifted, how the timeless body of the saints is the primary thing, with which the Church working in time has to be put in right relation. This is connected with an increasing anxiety, that the outward shall not be made more important than the inward,[1] and a peculiarly different attitude to Dissenters. In characteristic contrast to the contemptuous expressions about 'the meetingers' in the early Tractarian campaign is a sermon of 1839 on St. Mark ix. 38, 39 ('Forbid him not').[2] Certainly the apostolic Church theory is safeguarded by the peculiar argument, that the stranger made use of the name of Jesus without following the apostles, because the latter had not yet had the name of Christ named over them and the Church had not thereby been founded. When he comes to the question of the relation to modern sects, a quite different tone is heard, in place of reliance on the monopoly of the apostolic commission. 'Let us be far more bent on preaching our own doctrine than on refuting another's. Let us be far more set upon alluring souls into the right way, than on forbidding them the wrong. Let us be like racers in a course, who do not impede, but try to outstrip each other. Let us outstrip others in our lives and conversation. . . . Let us conquer by meekness, gentleness, forbearance, and perseverance.'[3]

How the motive of holiness plays a part in the great crisis of Newman's life, how it was perhaps the deepest and strongest of the impulses that led to it, it is not the time to discuss. How in his defence of the Church he is driven back from the earlier positions, to maintain the note of holiness as the most essential, really the one thing essential for a Church, has previously been related. So we need only point here to the previously quoted passage in his 'Letter to the Bishop of Oxford,' where for a moment everything else pales before the radiancy of holiness, and where he stretches out the hand of brotherhood to everyone, in whatever church he may be, who

[1] Cp. the sermon, 'The Visible Temple,' of 1840, *Parochial and Plain Sermons*, vol. vi. No. 20.

[2] 'The Fellowship of the Apostles' (*ibid.* vol. vi. No. 14).

[3] *Ibid.* p. 206.

has the note of holiness, and declares that 'the only way in which the members of our Church, so widely differing in opinion at this time, can be brought together in one, is by a "turning of heart" to one another. Argumentative efforts are most useful for this end, if they are subordinated to this sacred feeling, but till we try to love each other, and what is holy in each other, and wish to be all one, and mourn that we are not so, and pray that we may be so, I do not see what good can come of argument.'[1]

In 'Apologia' Newman describes how he attempted to build up a new Anglican position of defence on the foundation of 'the note of sanctity'—we have seen already how his 'Sermons on Subjects of the Day' contain the proof of this development—and how after that a new party was formed to the left of him within the movement, of men who 'cut into the original movement at an angle, fell across its line of thought, and then set about turning that line in their own direction.'[2] This was the Ward school, which has a special interest, because in it we see the progressive thought of the Church active without the hindrance of ballast from the mainly static period, and without being held back by loyalty to the traditional Anglican system. The most consistent presentation of the idea of the primacy of holiness in the religious life is found in Ward's 'Ideal of a Christian Church.'[3] The historical situation and the personal conditions which produced this work have already been sketched. Just as the chief practical

[1] *A Letter to the Right Reverend Father in God, Richard, Lord Bishop of Oxford* (Oxford, 1841), p. 44; *Via Media* (ed. 1908), vol. ii. p. 422. There is the same feeling in the preface to *Plain Sermons by Contributors to the Tracts*, where Isaac Williams renounces all alliance with men who merely for aesthetic or intellectual reasons defend Tractarian principles, but adds: 'But if, on the other hand, there shall be any who, in the silent humility of their lives, and in their unaffected reverence for holy things, show that they in truth accept these principles as real and substantial, by habitual purity of heart and serenity of temper give proof of their deep veneration for sacramental ordinances, these persons, whether our professed adherents or not, best exemplify the kind of character which the writers of *The Tracts for the Times* have wished to form' (*ibid.* vol. i. p. 1; quoted by Newman in *Apologia* (ed. 1864), p. 189).

[2] *Apologia*, p. 278.

[3] The complete title is, *The Ideal of a Christian Church considered in comparison with Existing Practice, containing a Defence of certain Articles in the 'British Critic' in Reply to Remarks on them in Mr. Palmer's Narrative* (London, 1844). A review and analysis of the argument is given by W. Ward, *W. G. Ward and the Oxford Movement*, pp. 249–289.

impulse in the author was the longing for holiness, so his argument in the last instance rests on the principle of 'the absolute supremacy of conscience in all ethical and religious questions,[1] and when he adds 'the high sacredness of hereditary religion,' he does not seem to have included the Anglicanism of modern days—and along with that, on what he himself calls a 'moral axiom,' adding that no mathematical axiom can be more certain: 'That where the fruits of holiness show themselves, there is the Holy Ghost, and there is really (so far as it goes) true doctrine.'[2] It is thus here we find the clearest expression of this previously discussed form of pragmatism. The only reality is the ethical world, with which conscience puts us in connection, but the conscience of the individual cannot do more than convince him of the existence of an 'Objective Somewhat—call it, if you please, Moral Truth,' but of this objective reality the individual's conscience can only discover the side with which it comes into practical contact. Therefore the real knowledge of the spiritual world, the world of reality, must be won by submission and obedience to a religious system.[3] And 'the temper of mind, which really leads us towards the truth, is that which desires most unreservedly to submit itself with all teachableness and humility to God's guidance—which anxiously and watchfully aims at the maintenance of all God's doctrines and commandments according to the light vouchsafed—and which ever presses eagerly forward towards a fuller vision of Him, towards every new glimpse of religious truth which may visit it from any quarter.'[4]

But the present object is not to expound this theory of religious knowledge, but to sketch the theory of the Church, which, at the outset of his work, the author builds up on this foundation. Here he draws the ideal 'of a Church which will fully answer to the craving of the soul for guidance, authority, and hallowing care.' He had earlier, in an article in the *British Critic*, maintained that if the Church is really to be able to be the guide of all, rich and poor, its distinguishing features must be 'very simple, obvious, and intelligible. They must not depend on education, or be brought out by abstruse

[1] *The Ideal*, p. 44.
[2] *Ibid.* p. 207.
[3] *Ibid.* pp. 509 f.
[4] *Ibid.* p. 563.

reasoning; but must at once affect the imagination and interest the feelings. They must bear with them a sort of internal evidence, which supersedes further discussion and makes their truth self-evident.'[1] The learned argumentation on which the static conception of the Church was built could scarcely be said to fulfil these requirements: it rested on proof difficult of access and subtle distinctions. Ward does not draw this negative conclusion, but instead lays down the marks he himself regards as satisfactory: the Church must satisfy the claims of conscience, Scripture, and holiness. He who places himself under her guidance must experience 'with daily increasing certainty (1) how exquisitely her system corresponds and answers externally to the internal voice of *conscience*, (2) how deep and entire the harmony of her doctrines with Scripture, (3) how high and unapproachable by other systems the sanctity which is her witnessed result.'[2] The practical ideal of the Church is comprehended in this, that the only task of the Church must be to save the souls entrusted to her care; the only proof she can give her children of her divine commission will be the spiritual benefits which she imparts.

It is obvious that this principle is in the sharpest contrast to the requirement of external proof which is peculiar to the static view of the Church. If in some measure the preceding exposition has attained its object, it must follow from that, that Ward's ideal of a Church as here formulated is only the consistent result of the elemental religious forces, whose outbreak and activity we have tried to follow. It is this which gives Ward's 'Ideal' its great interest in the history of Neo-Anglicanism, not the excesses to which the author was led by his peculiarly eccentric temperament and exaggerated reliance on his own logical dexterity.

These tendencies are distinguishable in the further drawing of his Church ideal, but come out strongest in its application. The ideal of the Church is dominated by the supremacy of the moral requirement and the pragmatic process of thought connected therewith. The chief truth the Church will have to proclaim to a fallen world, is the sad and serious character of sin. She will in her education of youth deeply impress this

[1] *The Ideal*, pp. 9 f. [2] *Ibid.* pp. 10 f.

on their minds, teach them constantly in their thoughts to combine the idea of beauty with that of holiness, ugliness with sin. She will inculcate such daily habits as may protect them immaculate from temptation and fall. She will preach penitence and amendment, and rouse the slumbering consciences of ordinary Christians. But therefore she must also be able to help souls on the right road by presenting religion in a light as attractive as truth will permit, must do like the father in the parable, who fell on the neck of the Prodigal Son and kissed him. But first and foremost she must 'train saints.' She has to make it possible to follow this calling for those who feel themselves called to a higher degree of self-abnegation and submission, 'to consecrate entirely to heavenly realities those ardent and enthusiastic feelings' which are often squandered on earthly objects. It is the lack of saints above all that makes the present-day Church weak.

To be able to do this the Church must possess a complete and accurate system of moral, ascetic and mystical theology, as a result of her combined experience. To this must correspond an equally complete system of dogmatic theology. 'There is perhaps no one principle in all history on which there is so surprising a consilience of *a priori* reasoning with observed phenomena as on this: that any Church, which shall not contain at her centre a deep dogmatic theology, exuberant with life, indomitable in energy, that Church is languid in her spiritual functions, wavering and unauthoritative in ruling her own subjects, feeble and prostrate in her external relations. And what the wonder? Saints are the very hidden life of a Church: and Saints cannot be nurtured on less than the full Catholic doctrine.'[1] This agreement between doctrine and life is the reason of the claim to authority on the part of dogmatic theology.

This Church will possess a ritual which will satisfy the highest requirements. She will be the same to all, a mother to the poor, will take up their cause, especially in view of the intolerable conditions which the rapid growth of industrialism had produced. Here we find in Ward something of the social passion which was, and is, one of the best features of Neo-Anglicanism. But the Church must also care

[1] *The Ideal*, pp. 19 f.

for the upper classes and their education, must on her own foundations build up a philosophical and scientific system capable of rivalling and vanquishing the now prevailing systems, which take no account of the fundamental facts of religion. Against the State she must be intrepid and independent, tell the truth to the powerful, and protect the weak.

It is not necessary to go further into the application of these principles, or to show how at almost every point they witness against the contemporary English Church, how the early Church itself, the court to which the defenders of *Via Media* loved to appeal, must condemn its mode of government, its articles of belief, its order and discipline, how finally the picture of the Roman Church comes out ever more plainly as the only one which in every feature answers to the ideal sketched. Yet the book was not written to explain the author's secession to Rome, but to defend him for remaining in the Church of England: he holds up the picture of Rome as a mirror for his own Church to reform itself on that model according to the principles concealed in its own nature but visibly expressed in Rome. The argument is practical, not theoretical. It is the question of finding the form of Church which best corresponds to the individual's religious needs, not that which from the theoretical point of view is the only true Church. That preference for Rome which comes out in Ward so strongly, rests on personal factors; it probably was there before his thoughts formulated his abstract ideal.

But apart from this it is a fact of the greatest moment for the historical comprehension of the Neo-Anglican Movement, that the one-sided emphasis laid on holiness, with its corollaries in the requirement of authority, obedience and asceticism, and along with them a certain measure of aestheticism (not only aiming at the 'beauty of holiness'), that these elements in a logical exposition, such as Ward's book aims at being, seem to point so directly to the Roman system. This answers in a manner which is more than accidental, to the Romanising tendency which ever more strongly appeared in the later history of Neo-Anglicanism. This tendency gets, perhaps, its deepest explanation in Ward's book, and to some extent, but only to some extent, its defence: it stands out as the consequence of one-sided emphasis on certain practical principles, especi-

ally the requirement of holiness, and the need of more intense worship, and on this ground a certain imitation of the system which perfects these principles may be defended—a certain measure of imitation, but not a slavish copying. The practical character of these principles makes it also explicable how the Romanising tendency could go so far, and yet not take the complete step of submission to Rome; it is not a matter of a theoretical question how to find the true Church, but of shaping a form of Church which answers to certain strongly felt religious needs. If outward interference had dealt with the Romanising tendency in Neo-Anglicanism, as Oxford University did with Ward, the result for the whole party would probably have been the same as it was with individual members. And in spite of everything the Church of England would thereby have been made poorer than she now is.

## CHAPTER XIV

### THE DOCTRINE OF JUSTIFICATION

In modern Church history the doctrine of justification has served as a real dividing-line between the two chief forms of Christianity, which for lack of better names we generally call the Protestant and the Catholic, but which perhaps, having regard to their fundamental character, we ought to call the prophetic and the mystic or sacramental. Of course in this we do not refer to any actual society, but to the chief tendencies, neither of which has entirely stamped any part of the Church. On the combination of both and their proper relation to each other depends the spiritual health of Christendom.

In his survey of the Catholic and the Evangelical conceptions of Justification, A. Ritschl[1] maintains that the difference consists in a different definition of the conception, in that Catholics mean by it the process by which the sinner becomes actively righteous, but the Evangelical sees in justification the divine act by virtue of which the Christian can be certain of that religious quality which it is the aim of Christianity to impart: the corresponding word to the Catholic *Justificatio* is the Protestant regeneration or sanctification. But he goes on to show that behind the difference of phrase is hidden a profound divergence in matter of content: the Protestant idea of justification has in view only the purely religious relation to God, on principle looks away from its moral realisation, and thus can present as the actual possession of believers what, according to the Catholic idea, can only be regarded as an object of hope. This is certainly an important and fundamental distinction, though Luther's own idea of justification cannot entirely be

[1] *Die Christliche Lehre von der Rechtfertigung und Versöhnung* (3rd ed., Bonn, 1888), vol. iii. pp. 34 f.

included under any of these categories. In Luther's own development, the beginning of a new epoch is marked by the appearance of the assurance of salvation.[1] The treatment of the religious type of the Oxford Movement has already shown us that it has no place for this thought—nay that assurance of salvation was bound to appear to its special temperament as a godless presumptuousness, and also that the moral orientation of Neo-Anglican theology made it incapable of rising to the bold grasp of divine grace as a purely objective and purely religious gift, which is the characteristic feature of the Lutheran doctrine of Justification, at once its strength and its weakness.

If in this respect the Oxford Movement stands on the Catholic side of the great dividing-line, it must also be called to mind how alien its deepest spirits are to every doctrine of merit. The accusation of Pelagianism which Protestant theologians have at times liberally directed against their adversaries, is often mistaken—although, as we have seen in the case of Froude, the peril is sometimes near at hand : but when it is a question of maintaining the majesty of the idea of God, there is hardly any antithesis between the most deeply religious spirits in both camps, though the self-surrender to God with the prophetic type of religion takes by preference the form of the consciousness of sin, with the mystic type, on the other hand, that of self-emptying, of holy waiting quietness.

But for our continued investigation another distinction is of greater importance, the distinction between imputed and infused or indwelling righteousness. This is in reality a distinction between two different conceptions of the nature of grace, the purely personal and the quasi-physical or substantial. Perhaps Protestants have been misled by imperfection of language, and have been too much inclined to regard these as marking higher and lower strata within the Christian religion, instead of being content with establishing the fact, that these different conceptions of grace are the deepest constitutive elements in two types of religion which within Christianity go side by side and complete rather than exclude each other. It is true that Catholic sacramentalism is based on St. Augustine's acceptance of a view of grace which, wherever it comes from, sees

[1] O. Ritschl, *Dogmengeschichte des Protestantismus* (Leipzig, 1912), vol. ii. part i, pp. 99 f.

in grace a divine energy, a substance, conceived on physical analogies, which can gradually and by certain means be infused.[1] But in St. Augustine himself this idea was combined with a relation to God, the deeply personal nature of which cannot be disputed. As regards the idea of grace, the most essential side of the Reformation was its insistence on the purely personal character of grace. It is this which gives its value to the idea of imputation, and which also puts forgiveness of sins in the centre of Evangelical theology: in spite of the forensic sound of the very word 'imputation,' and the perhaps too negative colour of the term 'forgiveness of sins,' they exclude any impersonal view of God's communication of Himself. But, on the other hand, this idea was never isolated or carried to excess by the Reformers themselves. Even after the appearance of the reforming view, Luther used the expression *gratia infusa*, though filled with a new content,[2] and his sacramental teaching appears to many of his interpreters to be a self-contradiction. And there is a risk that the tendencies within modern Protestantism, which a pretended zeal for the purity of personal religion has made averse to every form of mysticism, will be found to have watered down the conception of personality to such a degree that the very essence of religion is threatened. The fundamental paradox of Christian theism, our belief in an infinite yet personal God, runs the risk of being evaporated by those who seem inclined to limit His mode of operation after the pattern of human personality.

It is to be deplored that there has been no thorough treatment of the doctrine of Justification in the theology of the Anglican Church. What would require a special essay in the history of dogma cannot be attempted in these introductory remarks. But even a hasty orientation shows, how within Anglican theology the two above-mentioned lines run side by side. That the Lutheran idea of Justification is a fundamental motive both with Cranmer[3] and in the doctrinal formulae of the Reformed Church (Articles and

[1] Kirn, art. 'Gnade' in *Realencyclopädie für Prot. Theologie und Kirche*; Harnack, *Dogmengeschichte* (4th ed., Tübingen, 1910), vol. iii. p. 83.

[2] O. Ritschl, *op. cit.* p. 119.

[3] Hunt, *Religious Thought in England from the Reformation to the End of the Last Century* (London, 1810), vol. i. p. 15.

Homilies)[1] is a fact the importance of which is not lessened by moderation of expression. The most honoured father of older Anglicanism, Hooker, in spite of his disapproval of certain Lutheran expressions, in his famous sermon on this subject,[2] has a firmer grasp of the doctrine in its essence, and gives it clearer and more balanced expression, than most of its exponents.[3]

But during the seventeenth century the Catholic or mystic vein reappears in union with a stronger emphasis on the requirement of holiness, as, for instance, in Jeremy Taylor. Thus in a sermon, 'Righteousness Evangelical described' (on Matt. v. 20, the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees in contrast with that of the disciples), we find him describe 'the righteousness Evangelical,' which is 'a holy conversation, a god-like life, an universal obedience, a keeping nothing back from God, a sanctification of the whole man, and keeps not the body only, but the soul and spirit, unblamable to the coming of the Lord Jesus.'[4] Man receives God's grace through the sacraments, but he must prepare himself for it by a moral life, and thus his soul co-operates with God.[5] So here the thought of the sacramental communication of Grace is united

[1] See especially 'A Sermon of the Salvation of Mankind by only Christ our Saviour, from Sin and Death Everlasting,' in *Certain Sermons and Homilies*.

[2] 'A Learned Discourse of Justification, Works, and how the Foundation of Faith is Overthrown' (delivered by Hooker as Master of the Temple, 1606) is included in Keble's edition of Hooker's works (Oxford, 1836), vol. iii. No. 2, pp. 601–681.

[3] He describes the difference between Catholics and Protestants thus: 'We disagree about the nature of the very essence of the medicine whereby Christ cureth our disease; about the manner of applying it; about the number and power of the means which requireth in us for the effectual applying thereof to our soul's comfort. When they are required to show what that righteousness is whereby a Christian man is justified, they answer that it is a spiritual quality, which quality received into the soul, doth first make it to be one of them who are born of God: and secondly endue it with power to bring forth such works as they do that are born of Him' (*ibid.* p. 605); '. . . the little fruit we have in holiness, God knoweth, corrupt and unsound: we put no confidence at all in it: we challenge nothing in the world for it, we dare not call God to a reckoning, as if we had Him in our debt-books: our continual suit to Him is, and must be, to bear with our infirmities, to pardon our offences' (p. 614).

[4] *The Whole Works of the Right Reverend Jeremy Taylor* (ed. R. Heber), vol. vi. p. 238.

[5] *Ibid.* p. 223.

with the Pelagian tendency, which, not without reason, was imputed to Taylor.[1] In another sermon, 'Fides Formata, or Faith working by Love,' he maintains that 'no one is justified without being in some measure sanctified.'[2] This can perhaps be regarded as the characteristic standpoint of older High Anglicanism. It is most clearly expounded by Bishop Bull in his youthful work of 1670, 'Harmonia Apostolica,'[3] which expounds the doctrine of justification, starting from the epistle of St. James, and endeavouring to show its agreement with St. Paul. In this treatise, which was of the greatest importance for the Tractarian view, we must not ascribe so much weight to his cautious assertion of the importance of good works (since the author is evidently anxious not to give them any character of merit, and at least to his own satisfaction succeeds in making his doctrine harmonise both with the Thirty-nine Articles and the Augsburg Confession) as to (1) his assertion, definitely pointed against Luther and the *solifidiani* and *antinomi* among the Anglican theologians who entirely followed Luther, that Christ gave a new law, which we have to fulfil in place of the old ;[4] (2) the fundamental idea that *sanctificatio*, at least in some way and to some extent, must precede *justificatio* ; unless already man in some measure has become partaker of the divine nature, he cannot have forgiveness of his sins and a right to heavenly life.[5]

Bishop Thomas Wilson, who was esteemed as highly as Taylor by the Oxford school, in his 'Catechetical Instruction for Candidates for Holy Orders,' gives a definition of Justification, which

[1] Hunt, *op. cit.* vol. i. p. 341.

[2] Taylor, *op. cit.* p. 277. The text is St. Jac. ii. 24.

[3] The full title is *Harmonia Apostolica seu binae dissertationes, quarum in priore doctrina D. Jacobi de Justificatione ex operibus explanatur ac defenditur, in posteriore consensus D. Pauli cum Jacobo liquido demonstratur.* This work is the third volume of the collected edition of Bull's works by E. Burton (Oxford, 1827). The fourth volume is filled by the two sequels to *Harmonia*, viz. *Examen Censurae* and *Apologia pro Harmonia ejusque Auctore.*

[4] *Harmonia*, pp. 40 f.

[5] *Harmonia*, p. 20 ; *Examen Censurae*, p. 265. In particular the latter passage is highly characteristic in showing how closely this view of justification and sanctification is combined with the conception of grace as a divine substance : 'Constanter affirmo justificationem ex ordinatione divina praesupponere sanctificationem, saltem primam et imperfectiorem. . . . Breviter ; justitiae et sanctitati divinae repugnat . . . cuiquam peccata remittere, adeoque jus ad vitam caelestem donare, qui non a vitiis purgetur, quin et θείας φύσεως κοινωνός quodam modo fiat.'

seems clearly to express the Protestant view.[1] Of the theologians of the eighteenth century in this connection Waterland is especially important. In his treatise, 'A Summary View of the Doctrine of Justification,' he maintains the position of the Reformers, but without direct opposition to Bull, and with moderation, being inclined 'to maintain the doctrine of faith in such a way that the necessity of good works is not excluded; and so to maintain the good works, that the necessity of Christ's Atonement or God's free grace is not excluded.'[2] In his age Justification had received a new importance by opposition to the moralism of the Deistic school. We can only just indicate how it once more became a living reality within the Methodist circle, in which Wesley is the chief exponent of Lutheran influence.[3] But perhaps it will be wise to remember that the later opponents of this influence were bound to see it in the light of the exaggeratedly subjective and individualistic method of the Methodist teaching of conversion.

At the beginning of the nineteenth century the Lutheran doctrine of Justification had found an important exponent in Milner, the Church historian. In opposition to him Alexander Knox, in his above-mentioned 'Letter to Mr. Parken on Justification,'[4] criticises the 'forensic' doctrine of Justification, and sees in Justification the acquisition of a condition of inward not merely outward and formal righteousness, a moral change; and he tries to read this meaning into the Articles and Homilies,

[1] 'When a person, by the Spirit of God, is convinced of his guilt and danger and repents and flies to God for help, when God, passing by the punishment which such a sinner has deserved, pardons him, and admits him into favour, and into a state of salvation, such person is said to be justified. Now all this is owing to the mere free grace, and mercy and goodness of God on account of what Jesus Christ hath done and suffered for us, not for anything that any man has done or can do' (*Works of Bishop Wilson* (Bath, 1816), vol. iv. p. 397).

[2] *The Works of the Rev. Daniel Waterland, now first Collected and Arranged* (Oxford, 1823), vol. ix. p. 470.

[3] An episode of special interest is Wesley's conversation on Justification with Bishop Butler, who declares that 'our faith itself is a good work, it is a virtuous temper of mind,' and that the doctrine of justification by faith alone was only tenable under the presupposition of an arbitrary predestination. Wesley, however, when pressed by Butler as to what he meant by faith, could reply in expressions taken from the Homilies. Hunt, *Religious Thought in England*, vol. ii. pp. 288 f. (from Wesley's *Journal*).

[4] *Remains of Alexander Knox, Esq.* (London, 1834), vol. i. pp. 256–288. The letter was written in 1810.

and reconcile them with Scripture and the Fathers. From the point of view above explained it is especially interesting to find that Knox not only makes infant baptism a vehicle of Justification, but in a later letter gives unalloyed expression to a mystical conception.[1] This is one of the essential points in which Knox anticipates the Oxford Movement.

During the first years of this movement, the Lutheran doctrine of Justification had been newly formulated in O'Brien's work—' An Attempt to Explain and Establish the Doctrine of Justification by Faith in Ten Sermons upon the Nature and Effects of Faith.' This must have contributed to give a fresh impulse to discussion. Merely in passing, Newman refers to it in the well-known lectures which still remain the chief contribution of Neo-Anglicanism to this question. Ward again in his criticism starts directly from O'Brien's work,[2] though according to his own account he used part of Luther's commentary on Galatians, and he declares that ' never was my conscience so shocked and revolted by any work not openly professing immorality.' [3] Expressions of the most intense hatred of this doctrine abound throughout his work ; [4] it is to him the very negation of the principle on which his own system rests, that of obedience, of spiritual self-discipline. It is the consistent development of tendencies which he finds scattered about in the English Church, tendencies to maintain that ' habitual and laborious watchfulness, the painful effort

[1] *Letter to D. Parken, Esq., on the Character of Mysticism* of 1811 ; cp. the following exposition of the Incarnation : ' Animal nature was to be magnetized ; to make the attraction infallible, Godhead takes our animal nature, in its noblest and happiest form, into a personal union, and in that union submits to and combines every conceivable circumstance that could tend to modify the moral energies of Deity into the most powerful medicine and the most invigorating food for diseased and destitute man' (*Remains*, vol. i. p. 300).

[2] *Ideal of a Christian Church*, p. 167 : here is continued a discussion which began in the *British Critic*.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 169 note.

[4] Without asserting that it is the worst of its kind, an example may be given of a quotation by Ward from his own article in the *British Critic* : ' When we speak of Lutheranism, we speak of an abstract doctrine which cannot, we verily believe, be held consistently even by the devils ; but which is held to an alarming extent among Evangelicals, though inconsistently. And of this abstract doctrine we now say that the considerations in the text show it to be worse, that is, to be more fundamentally at variance with our higher and better nature, than Atheism itself ' (*ibid.* p. 305).

to change our will and purify our hearts by exercising ourselves, day by day, in the events of ordinary life as they occur ; the humbling ourselves and doing penance in remembrance of our past sins, one by one ; the labouring constantly to keep before our minds the thought of Death, Judgment, Heaven, Hell ; that all this is at least not so imperatively required under Christianity as under natural religion. . . . Men speak as though, in some sense at least, and in some degree, the Gospel were a reversal of the natural Law, instead of being solely and exclusively its complement.'[1] The author attributes an altogether special importance to this thought—it is the same thought of the Gospel as a *lex Christi*, which we lately found in Bull[2]—and defines the Lutheran doctrine of Justification as the theory which clearly and expressly denies this. It is characteristic that he describes Lutheranism as a heresy chiefly from the standpoint of natural religion, that is as conflicting with the principles which to him are axiomatically true, such as, that ' moral and religious truth can only be comprehended in proportion to moral discipline,' that ' in no other way than by a series of right acts can a habit of acting rightly be acquired.'[3] It is therefore in conflict with the whole orthodox system, because it denies the principle on which that rests, viz. the principle of obedience.

It is entirely beyond the limits of our present task to enter into an argument to the contrary. Ward's standpoint is chiefly interesting as a radical consequence of the moralistic view of religion, the roots of which, as we saw, go deep in Anglican thought. He has certainly none of the self-sufficiency which has caused many of the popular expressions of this view to take on so dangerously Pelagian a colour. On the contrary, his religion shows a high degree of the sense of men's nothingness in the sight of God.[4] But the moralistic view itself was

[1] *Ideal of a Christian Church*, p. 248.

[2] Cp. also Newman's sermon, ' The Strictness of the Law of Christ ' (*Parochial and Plain Sermons*, vol. iv. No. 1).

[3] *Ibid.* p. 301.

[4] W. Ward (*W. G. Ward and the Oxford Movement*, p. 216) relates how his father found an inexhaustible source of amusement in the answer he once received from a representative of conventional Anglicanism, when he was dilating to him on the infinite distance between man and his Creator, and said : ' When we realise this we feel that our attitude in the presence of God should be abject.' The answer was : ' No, not abject, my dear Ward, not abject. Certainly it should be a deferential attitude, but not abject.'

so deeply based in his temperament and the special demands of his nature—the requirements of moralism were perhaps more deep-rooted than religion—that he was incapable of even comprehending the idea that this view might contain a humiliation and profanation of the sovereign majesty of religion, while this majesty was protected and recognised by this curious Wittenberg heresy, which he could not find words strong enough to condemn. It is further important to notice that he quotes it as a special offence of this that 'it leads its victims to fix their gaze on the internal workings of their own minds, instead of the great object of Revelation, as their mainstay and encouragement.' It is important for this reason, that it is an expression of the constantly recurring Anglican misconception of Lutheranism as an exaggerated subjectivism, though on the contrary it desires nothing more than to turn away the eyes from self-centred speculation on the process of the self-sanctification of the individual to the objective facts of salvation through Christ. Perhaps this misunderstanding chiefly proceeds from the fact that modern Anglicanism has seen Lutheran thoughts taking concrete form in the shape which Wesleyan Methodism gave to them.

Ward's chief interest is to refute Luther, not to produce a doctrine of Justification of his own. That essentially he tried to appropriate the Roman doctrine appears, however, plainly enough, and the denial of 'indwelling righteousness' becomes to him a special article of accusation. But it is to Newman that we have to go to study the way in which the Catholic line breaks out with new strength in Neo-Anglicanism.

Newman's 'Lectures on Justification' of 1838, though they have not generally tempted his biographers to close study,[1] form perhaps the chief theological document of the Oxford Movement, the most important attempt to find the theological expression of its piety. The book belongs to the golden age of *Via Media* and hence fights definitely on a double front, against Rome as much as against Wittenberg. Modern Roman moral

[1] R. H. Hutton (*Cardinal Newman*, 2nd ed., p. 83) finds the book 'somewhat straw-chopping and dry.' H. Stoel (*Kardinaal Newman*, vol. i. p. 148) informs us that the treatise won high praise from Döllinger, but regrets that he cannot give an analysis of it.

theology, which was the object of Ward's undivided admiration, had no attraction to Newman in this his earlier phase; but in agreement with the leading idea of *Via Media*, he draws freely from the resources of the early Church, and if any form or system is visible in the background, it is especially that of St. Augustine: it is not the first time that we see the mighty shadow of the African Doctor fall across the path of the Oxford Movement. If we follow back the lines which now diverge so completely, we shall find Newman seems to think that they are not at all irreconcilable, and really rest on the one-sided emphasis of a certain aspect, in itself correct, if viewed in connection with the other sides.[1] Of the two main lines one is described by the formula of Justification by Faith, the other that of Justification by Obedience. The Anglican *Via Media* goes between the two: its formula is Justification by Baptism.[2] That this, not faith, is the 'primary instrument' of Justification is maintained against the Lutheran doctrine, which is also faulty in that it maintains that the faith which justifies imparts its gift without the exercise or even the presence of love.[3] The second main line, that of obedience, is not faulty like the first; it is only incomplete; and only when it is pressed in a one-sided way, as in the later Roman Church, to which the inward renewal revealed in obedience is the *unica formalis causa* of Justification, is it in conflict with the Anglican position. In its main features it is true, and it is referred to with warmth and enthusiasm largely in expressions derived from St. Augustine (especially *De spiritu et littera*). The Scripture proof of this doctrine need not, as with the Protestant, be derived merely from one or two books, but can be based on the unanimous witness of both Testaments. 'What the Psalmist longs after, and Prophets promise, and Apostles announce as given by Almighty God, is one and the same, the capacity of serving God acceptably, or the gift of righteousness,

[1] So in the advertisement to the third edition. When in 1874 Newman re-edits this Anglican youthful work, it is significant that he can give an assurance that he still in all essentials holds the same doctrine, though he must recall a few points as conflicting with the decrees of Trent.

[2] This is precisely St. Augustine's view (Loofs, *Leitfaden*, p. 387): with him, as generally in older Catholic theology, the idea of *justificatio ex fide* is related to Baptism.

[3] *Lectures on Justification*, p. 31 (ed. 1838) (p. 29, ed. 1908).

not a shadow but a substance, not a name but a power, not an imputation but an inward work.'[1] This doctrine has also behind it the whole witness of the Christian Church, it is a real, intelligible, and practical doctrine, while the Lutheran is a novelty which has only three centuries behind it, and properly is a return to Judaism in that it offers shadows and promises in the place of reality. 'Reputed justification was the gift of the Law; but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ. Away then with this modern, this private, this arbitrary, this tyrannical system, which promising liberty conspires against it; which abolishes sacraments to introduce barren and dead ordinances; and for the real participation of Christ and justification through His Spirit, would, at the very marriage-feast, feed us on shells and husks, who hunger and thirst after righteousness.'[2] The doctrine of Justification taught by Continental Protestantism is false; the Roman incomplete, but is completed by St. Augustine.

Lectures III to V are devoted to making clear the conception of justification according to Newman's view. First he allows that the word contains the idea of *counting righteous*, but includes *making righteous*,[3] an imparting of righteousness and holiness; but the declaration of righteousness precedes the actual making righteous and the process of sanctification. So far there is truth in the forensic mode of thought: justification is in one of its essential points an acquittal instead of a condemnation of the sinner before God's tribunal, a free forgiveness for Christ's sake.[4] But this point is insolubly united with another, the assurance of holiness for the future. God deals

[1] *Lectures on Justification*, p. 39 (1908, p. 37). Examples are quoted from all these groups of writings. From St. Augustine is borrowed the thought of a typological correspondence between the giving of the Law on Mount Sinai, and the writing of the New Law in the hearts of Christians by the Spirit on the first Pentecost: 'that Law then so implanted is our justification' (p. 50).

[2] The same thought occurs in a sermon of 1841, 'Judaism of the Present Day' (*Parochial and Plain Sermons*, vol. vi. No. 13, p. 61). To regard justification as simply consisting in God's accounting a man righteous, is to remain at the Jewish standpoint: Christianity contains something more, viz. making righteous. This charge against Protestantism, which perhaps must be viewed in the light of the same censure on the Oxford school of being Judaisers in Arnold's article, 'The Oxford Malignants,' may seem surprising, but is in its way an interesting expression of Newman's instinctive feeling of the contrast between the mystic-sacramental and the prophetic types of religion.

[3] *Lectures on Justification*, p. 70.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 77.

with us as already righteous, in that He anticipates the coming development, which will finally make us perfect in His sight. In this sense the expression 'imputed righteousness' is correct.[1]

But it is plain that justification and salvation to Newman do not depend in the first instance on the free grace of forgiveness but on the work of sanctification. The state of salvation, it is said in a sermon specially illuminating in this context,[2] is 'a state of holiness; not one in which we may be *pardoned*, but in which we are *obedient*.' Through sin man falls from this state. One cannot therefore speak of a justified sinner. 'If he is justified and accepted, he has ceased to be a sinner. The Gospel only knows of justified saints; if a saint sins he ceases to be justified and beecomes a condemned sinner.'[3]

The fundamental idea is of course that imputed righteousness is only one side, one mode of regarding the real active righteousness. The same process, according as one has its passive or active side in view, may be called imputing or justifying holiness. 'Surely it is a strange paradox to say that a thing is not because He says that it is . . . and the glory of His pronouncing us righteous lies in His leaving us unrighteous.'[4] On the other hand it does not diminish our guilt that He gives us more than mere acquittal, that He also gives us 'intrinsic acceptableness.'

[1] *Parochial and Plain Sermons* ('The Law of the Spirit'), vol. v. No. 11, p. 158. This is how St. Paul's words about Faith being imputed as righteousness are explained: 'Faith is the element of all perfection; he who begins with faith will end in unspotted and entire holiness. . . . He who believes has not yet perfect righteousness and unblamableness, but he has the first-fruits of it.'

[2] *Ibid.* vol. v. No. 13, p. 178.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 190. This standpoint, which he supports by a reference to the Apostles' description of the early Church—'Their description of the early Church is almost like an account of Angels and the Spirits of the Just'—leads him significantly enough to classify sins as sins of weakness, which do not involve the loss of the state of grace, and greater sins which cannot exist along with faith in a man. This is to some extent a reproduction of the history of penitential discipline in the early Church.

[4] *Lectures on Justification*, p. 84 (ed. 1908, p. 78). God's imputing of righteousness has a creative power: 'Justification is an announcement or fiat of Almighty God, which breaks upon the gloom of our natural state as the creative Word upon Chaos . . . it declares the soul righteous, and in that declaration, on the one hand conveys pardon for our past sins, and on the other makes it actually righteous' (*ibid.* p. 90; ed. 1908, p. 83).

This is the very pith of the matter: justification consists in a something, a quality, a substance, which comes into and changes man, and makes him acceptable. 'The justifying Word thus conveys the Spirit, and the Spirit makes our works "pleasing" and "acceptable" to God, and acceptableness is righteousness; so that the justified are just, really just, in degree more or less, but really in this respect—that their obedience has in it a gracious quality, which the obedience of unregenerate man has not.'[1] This is the proper gift of justification, the entrance into and presence in the soul of the Holy Ghost. This, to become thus the temple of the Holy Ghost, must involve a re-creation, a raising out of a state of nature to a state of grace, and this must bear fruit in holiness and obedience.[2] But the presence of the Spirit is only a form or a means of the Presence of Christ: it is the Spirit which makes Him present in us, and adapts Christ's work to us. 'Christ then is our Righteousness by dwelling in us by the Spirit; He justifies us by entering into us. . . . This is really and truly our justification, not faith, not holiness, not (much less) a mere imputation, but through God's mercy, the very Presence of Christ.'[3]

This way of thinking opens the gate to sacramental mysticism; it is the sacraments which impart this presence of Christ, they are therefore means of our justification. This happens first in Baptism, but, 'as Holy Communion conveys a more awful presence of God than Holy Baptism, so it must be the instrument of a higher Justification.'[4] The Sacrament is 'a grafting invisibly into the Body of Christ, a mysterious union with Him, and a fellowship in all the grace and blessedness which is hidden in Him. . . . The Almighty Father, looking on us, sees not us, but this Sacred Presence, even His dearly-beloved Son spiritually manifested in us.'[5] Justification, therefore, is produced not by a mere gazing on the Cross, as the Israelites gazed on the

[1] *Lectures on Justification*, p. 99 (ed. 1908, p. 91); *Parochial and Plain Sermons*, vol. v. No. 11, p. 157.

[2] *Parochial and Plain Sermons* ('Righteousness not of Us, but in Us') vol. v. No. 10, p. 138. 'As a light placed in a room pours its rays on all sides, so the presence of the Holy Ghost imbues us with life, strength, holiness, love, acceptableness, righteousness' (*ibid.* p. 235).

[3] *Lectures on Justification*, p. 167 (ed. 1902, p. 150).

[4] *Ibid.* p. 169 (ed. 1908, p. 152). [5] *Ibid.* p. 183 (ed. 1908, pp. 160 f.).

brazen serpent in the wilderness, by confidence that the suffering of Christ guarantees once for all the salvation of the individual, but the Cross must be raised in us, made present in us through the Spirit.[1] In this thought of the mystic presence of Christ mediated through the Sacraments, Newman sees a safeguard, not only against the Protestant confidence that the outward atonement is imputed to the believer, but also against the Roman tendency to a doctrine of merit, a tendency to 'view the influences of grace, not as the operations of a Living God, but as a something to bargain about, and buy, and traffick with, as if religion were, not an approach to things above us, but a commerce with our equals concerning things we can master.' So one cannot properly speak of a *justitia inhaerens*, as if it were ours by nature, but only of *justitia adhaerens*, which is sustained in us by external means. For to what can we point as the condition of our justification? Not to anything of our own, whether our faith, or our holiness, but 'to the Glorious Shekinah of the Word Incarnate as to the true wedding-garment in which the soul must be dressed.'[2] It is therefore not only the Cross, the atoning Death, that we must appropriate in an inward way, but Christ Himself will be present in us as the crucified, but still more as the risen and glorified Lord. His image is formed in us: 'He is formed in us, born in us, suffers in us, rises again in us, lives in us; and this not only by a succession of events, but all at once: for He comes to us as a Spirit, all dying, all rising again, all living.'[3] 'The Divine Life which raised Him, flowed over and availed unto our rising again from sin and condemnation. The Spirit within His Sacred Manhood, reviving on the third day, only more powerful for Its brief overthrow, changed It into Spirit, assimilating It to Itself without ceasing to be man, and imparted It to us to dwell as a new creating, transforming Power in our hearts.'[4] The thought of the Incarnate Godhead indwelling in us gives wings to the argument, a living faith rises out of the fetters of dogmatic

[1] *Lectures on Justification*, p. 203 (ed. 1908, p. 175); *Parochial and Plain Sermons*, vol. v. No. 10, p. 161.

[2] *Lectures on Justification*, p. 219 (ed. 1908, p. 190).

[3] *Parochial and Plain Sermons*, vol. v. No. 10, p. 139.

[4] *Lectures on Justification*, p. 239 (cp. ed. 1908, p. 207, where this passage has undergone alteration).

formulae, and creates a classical expression of the religious content of sacramental mysticism.

Thus one might describe the words which Newman puts into the mouth of the Risen Saviour as an exposition of St. John xx. 11, where our Lord says to St. Mary Magdalene—'Touch Me not.' 'Thou shalt have Me whole and entire. I will be near thee, I will be in thee; I will come into thy heart; a whole Saviour; a whole Christ, in all My fulness as God and Man, in the awful virtue of that Body and Blood which has been taken into the Divine Essence of the Word, and is indivisible from it, and has atoned for the sins of the world—not by external contact, not by partial possession, not by momentary approaches, not by barren manifestation, but inward in presence and intimate in fruition, a principle of life and a seed of immortality, that thou mayest "bring forth fruit unto God."'[1]

Thus justification becomes the act whereby man, in ever-increasing measure, appropriates the nature of God, the act also whereby God actively enters into, infuses Himself into man, and draws him upwards. 'This is our justification, our ascent through Christ to God, or God's descent through Christ to us; we may call it either of the two; we ascend into Him, He descends into us; we are in Him, He in us; Christ being the One Mediator—the Way, the Truth, and the Life, joining earth with heaven. And this is our true righteousness—not the mere name of righteousness, not only forgiveness or favour as an act of God's mind, not only sanctification within (great indeed as these blessings would be, yet it is somewhat more)—it implies the one, it involves the other, it is the indwelling of our glorified Lord.'[2] Thus the type of religion, the image of which we are endeavouring to fix, is drawn for

[1] *Lectures on Justification*, p. 250 (ed. 1908, p. 217). With this is connected Col. iii. 3, 'Your life is hid with Christ in God,' which is interpreted in the same manner. 'Thus when St. Paul says that our life is hid with Him in God, we may suppose him to intimate that our principle of existence is no longer a mortal, earthly principle, such as Adam's after his fall, but that we are baptized and hidden anew in God's glory, in that Shekinah of light and purity which we lost when Adam fell,—that we are new-created, enriched, transformed, spiritualized, glorified in the Divine nature, that through the participation of Christ we receive, as through a channel, the true presence of God within and without us, imbuing us with sanctity and immortality' (p. 251; ed. 1908, p. 218).

[2] P. 252 (ed. 1908, p. 219), following on the quotation in the preceding note.

us in outlines, the plainness of which it needs no exposition further to emphasise. One more feature only must be brought out: how the thought of sharing in the glory of the risen Lord preponderates over confidence in the atoning work of the Cross, how Easter overshadows Good Friday, and makes its message only a part of its own—and how this undoubtedly is a revival, not merely a mechanical reproduction, of the primitive feeling. 'If . . . the Resurrection be the means by which the Atonement is applied to each of us, if it be our justification, if in it are conveyed all the gifts of grace and glory which Christ has purchased for us, if it be the commencement of His giving Himself to us for a spiritual sustenance, of His feeding us with that Bread which has already been perfected on the Cross, and is now a medicine of immortality, it is that very doctrine which is most immediate to us, in which Christ most closely approaches us, from which we gain life, and out of which issue our hopes and our duties.'[1]

But this religious temper, which thus receives a rich and harmonious expression, must be brought into relation with the given dogmatic formulation, especially the doctrine of Justification by faith alone, which is found in the eleventh and following of the Thirty-nine Articles. It is not necessary to enter into the very sophistical exposition by which Newman, partly with the help of the Homilies (as more fully in Tract 90), tries to deal with the phrases of the Articles, and make them agree with his own doctrine of the Sacraments as the means of justification. It comes to this, that Faith is the organ by which the soul appropriates the working of outward means. But its place must be exactly balanced in relation to Baptism, which brings new birth, the Eucharist, which is the immediate

[1] *Op. cit.* p. 254 (ed. 1908, p. 222). With respect to the primitive view of the sacramental participation in Christ as the 'medicine of immortality,' cp. Keble in a Good Friday sermon, 'The Christian Good-Night' (*Plain Sermons*, vol. vi. No. 175, p. 88), and the next, an Easter sermon, 'Christ Uprising': 'Christ is in the meanest of His people, as a life-giving Spirit, a fountain of eternal life.' The Christian will even in the grave 'abide a member of Christ. He may lie down and sleep and seem alone and helpless, but he has that within him which still sustains him, still keeps him in true communion with God'; cp. p. 97. To Keble such thoughts easily assume a palpable reality, which takes them out of the sphere of mysticism into that of mythology. Pusey expresses the same idea, in deeper mystical spirit, in a sermon, 'Christ Risen our Justification' (No. 15 in *Sermons from Advent to Whitsuntide*).

source of the new life, love, which is its ' plastic power, ' and obedience, which is ' the atmosphere in which faith breathes.' Faith is a God-given and wonderful gift, which ' alone coalesces with the Sacraments, brings them into effect, dissolves (as it were) their outward cases, and through them unites the soul to God.' [1]

But the question is not merely to define the function of faith, but to say what justifying faith is. In this connection Newman maintains a doctrine of *fides formata* in conscious opposition to Luther, but also under the impression of the theory of religious knowledge, which later was to take definite shape, first in the University Sermons, and then in the ' Grammar of Assent.' Faith cannot be merely confidence, for confidence in God's promise alone could not have such a fruitful effect, unless the heart had been previously prepared and softened.[2] Nor can it be merely the *assent* taught by Rome, which takes for granted, and passively agrees, a merely colourless outline. The outlines must be filled up and coloured. This is what the Anglican Homilies do, describing faith as including both confidence and obedience. The Lutherans stop half-way, give a tint to the outlines, but do not finish the picture ; they allow faith to grow into confident assurance, but refuse to let it include obedience.[3] But his own picture of the nature and content of faith is drawn by Newman against the background of his doctrine of religious knowledge, in that he postulates ' that it is an original means of knowledge, not resolvable into sense or reason, confirmed indeed by experience, as they are, but founded on a supernaturally implanted instinct, an instinct developed by religious obedience, and determining the mind to the word of Christ and His Apostles as its refuge.' [4] It is this instinct which

[1] *Op. cit.* p. 271 (ed. 1908, p. 237). Newman urges that the Homilies speak of justification by faith only in Melanchthon's spirit, not in Luther's, as ' an emblem or image of the free grace of our redemption,' as a living expression, instead of saying ' by God only ' (p. 278 ; ed. 1908, p. 244). At a later stage he formulated the expression that faith is the title for justification, but the means of its imparting are the Sacraments of the Church : ' None are justified but those who are grafted into the justified body, and faith is not an instrument of grafting, but a title to be grafted ' (*Parochial and Plain Sermons*, vol. vi. p. 170) ; cp. also Tract No. 90 (*Via Media*, vol. ii. p. 282).

[2] P. 294 (ed. 1908, p. 257).

[3] P. 299 (ed. 1908, p. 261).

[4] P. 306 (ed. 1908, p. 267).

impels the elect, whose heart is opened, to make 'the venture of faith,' to grasp the paradox of the Gospel, to find it confirmed in life by obedience, and so win the crown of justification.

When Newman sums up his presentation of the nature of justifying faith, he does so, not without a struggle, in Luther's words[1] about the effective 'incarnate' faith, which is compared to the Divine Incarnation; just as different expressions may be used of Christ's different natures, so one can also speak of faith without or in connection with the works in which it is expressed. And he adds that faith is said to justify, because it includes within itself all Christian virtues and works. 'It seems then, that whereas Faith on our part fitly answers, or is the correlative, as it is called, to grace on God's part, Sacraments are but God's acts of grace, and good works are but our acts of faith; so that whether we say we are justified by faith, or by works, or by Sacraments, all these mean but this one doctrine, that we are justified by grace, given through Sacraments, impetrated by faith manifested in works.'[2]

But as if he feared that he had made too great concessions to the Protestant position, Newman concludes his book with a violent attack on what he regards as its fundamental error, building on the subjective in place of the objective, in putting the individual feeling in the central position. He meets the charge of wanting to divide man from God by laws, dogmas, and rites, by inverting it; it is the opposite side which makes the talk of justification and emphasis on the personal state of the soul hide the view of Christ Himself, it makes preaching

[1] From commentary on Gal. iii. (Newman, *ibid.* p. 345; cp. ed. 1908, p. 300, where this passage is altered and the following words excluded: 'Then follows an illustration of very sacred character, which I quote, yet wishing I were using the words of someone else'). Along with the commentary on Galatians, Newman has at least some knowledge of *De libertate Christiana*, and is thus honourably distinguished from even very learned recent Anglican theologians.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 348 (ed. 1908, p. 303). A sermon by Keble, 'Justifying Faith,' in *Plain Sermons*, vol. viii. p. 248, which otherwise presents the Evangelical point of view, in its emphasis on the importance of works, seems to come very near to the pure doctrine of merit. The Lord reckons up and 'treasures up every one of our good thoughts, and actions, and self-denials.' On the other hand, every conscious sin must affect our spiritual condition; it must be confessed, and seriously repented, 'but there is reason to believe that it never may nor can so vanish as if it had never been. It will make some difference to us, for aught we know, to all eternity' (*ibid.* p. 240).

and reasoning take the first place. 'It is they who are guilty of Judaism'; the formula of justification becomes what the law was to the Jews, it takes the place of Christ. Not the defenders of objective Sacramental religion are idolaters, but he who adores his own feelings and convictions, who 'does not contemplate the Grace of the Blessed Eucharist, the Body and Blood of His Saviour Christ, except (O shameful and fearful error!) as a quality of his own mind.'[1] 'To look at Christ is to be justified by faith; to think of being justified by faith is to look away from Christ and to fall from grace.'[2]

It cannot be denied that the charges are to some extent justified, in so far as they are directed against certain weakened and sentimental specimens of later Evangelicalism. And though Newman allows and points out that Luther establishes the doctrine of Justification as a principle, not as a rule of life, and that he lays down this principle as a safeguard against the endeavour to put one's own self in the centre of religion, yet he makes him responsible for later aberrations. 'He found Christians in bondage to their works and observances; he released them by his doctrine of faith; and he left them in bondage to their feelings. . . . For outward signs of grace he substituted inward; for reverence towards the Church, contemplation of self.'[3] Yet Newman's thorough-going study makes it harder for him than later for Ward, to make Luther the target of a criticism which applies to a certain type of Evangelicalism. But it is certainly a typically Lutheran feeling which he has in view though it is not expressed, a feeling, a temper, which contains the negation of his own religious position, the feeling of confidence, and joy in the assurance of salvation. We have already indicated that the typically Tractarian temper of anxiety and unrest is the diametrical opposite of this. The denial of any possibility of assurance is one of the corner-stones of Newman's practical

[1] *Lectures on Justification*, p. 378 (ed. 1908, p. 330).

[2] *Ibid.* p. 388 (ed. 1908, p. 339); *Parochial and Plain Sermons* ('Self-Contemplation'), vol. ii. No. 15.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 389 (ed. 1908, p. 340): 'And thus, whereas he himself held the proper efficacy of the Sacraments, he has led others to disbelieve it; whereas he preached against reliance on oneself, he introduced it in a more subtle shape; whereas he preferred to make the written Word all in all, he sacrificed it in its length and breadth, to the doctrine he had wrested from a few texts.'

teaching.[1] It is again an important point of contact with St. Augustine. To Newman as to his great predecessor this feeling of uncertainty is one of the strongest arguments for laying hold of the institutional Church: to belong to it, perhaps, does not give an absolute guarantee, but a higher degree of probability in the attainment of salvation. We have seen how in Newman's personal development the question of the right Church became infinitely serious, because it was the salvation of the individual which was in question in the last instance.

Certainly nothing could be more unjust than to accuse Newman of Pelagianism. To him, if to anyone, God was the only source of all good works, of all holiness, as of all beauty; if anyone, he knew the necessity of sinful man's humiliation before the Holy One: 'All teaching about duty and obedience, about attaining heaven, and about the office of Christ towards us, is hollow and unsubstantial, which is not built here, in the doctrine of our original corruption and helplessness; and in consequence of original guilt and sin. Christ Himself indeed is the foundation, but a broken, self-abased, self-renouncing heart is (as it were) the ground and soil in which the foundation must be laid; and it is but building on the sand to profess to believe in Christ, yet not to acknowledge that without Him we can do nothing. It is what is called the Pelagian heresy. . . .'[2] Complete

[1] E.g. *Parochial and Plain Sermons* ('Peace and Joy amid Chastisement'), vol. iv. No. 8, p. 127: 'But again a person may say—"I have a conviction I have this faith; I feel I have; I feel I can appropriate the merits of Christ." Or again: "I have an assurance that I am forgiven." True, but where does Scripture tell us that such an assurance, without ground for it beyond our feeling it, comes from God? Where is it promised? Till it is found there, we must be content not to be sure, and to fear and hope about ourselves at once'; *Ibid.* ('Ventures of Faith') vol. iv. No. 20, p. 295: 'Our duty as Christians lies in this, in making ventures for eternal life without the absolute certainty of success.'

[2] *Parochial and Plain Sermons* ('Righteousness not of Us but in Us'), vol. v. No. 10, p. 134. Pusey, to some extent, modifies Newman's doctrine of justification in the introduction to *A Letter to . . . Richard, Lord Bishop of Oxford, on the Tendency to Romanism* (4th ed., London, 1840), *e.g.* p. xxv: 'Again the righteousness thus claimed as being inwrought is not (one is ashamed to be compelled to state it) the ground of the Christian's acceptance; the righteousness of the Christian inwrought by Christ is not anything out of Christ, in whom the Christian lives, the gift is not separate from the Giver; spiritual life is not, any more than natural, independent of Him, in Whom we live, and move, and have our being; rather He Himself is our Life, pouring His life into us here, to return to Him hereafter'; cp. also Pusey's *University Sermon on Justification* of 1853, pp. 3 f.

quotations would show that it is by no means only the name he abjures.

As plainly as in the matter of assurance, does the contrast with the Lutheran doctrine of Justification come out in the other main point which was fixed at the outset. Protestant criticism was soon ready with its formula, the same with which it so often thought it could reject tendencies whose intense religion and burning desire for holiness would not fit into their scheme ; they said, Newman confuses Justification and Sanctification. In 1842 Merle-d'Aubigné clearly and vigorously inculcated this view to his theological students at Geneva,[1] and English critics were only too glad to follow his lead.[2] Without denying the justice of the remark in principle, it seems to me rather to move in the region of academic distinctions than in that of religious realities. The essential opposition would rather consist in different conceptions of the nature of grace. To Newman grace is, as we saw, in the first instance, an infusion of the Divine Nature, and though accompanied by forgiveness of sins as a consequential phenomenon it has rather the character of a *medicina* than of *benevolentia Dei erga peccatorem.* The preponderance of the idea of *gratia infusa* is perhaps the surest guide to the land of sacramental mysticism. In the discussion of the doctrine of Justification we have seen Neo-Anglicanism definitely cross the frontier of this land.

[1] H. Merle-d'Aubigné, *Genève et Oxford, Discours prononcé dans la séance d'ouverture de l'école de Théologie de Genève le* 3 *Octobre* 1842 (Genève, 1842). See, *e.g.*, p. 26 : ' La justification n'est point, selon ces docteurs, cet acte judiciaire, par lequel Dieu, à cause de la mort expiatoire de Christ, déclare nous tenir pour justes : elle est confondue par eux, comme par Rome, avec l'œuvre de l'Esprit ' ; p. 29 : ' Chez-nous la justification est la cause, et la sanctification est l'effet. Chez ces docteurs, au contraire, la sanctification est la cause, et la justification est l'effet.' This, however, is inconsistent with Pusey's express statement (*op. cit.* p. xxvii) : ' Justification is, as a cause, antecedent to sanctification, in which it issues.'

[2] *E.g.* R. Weaver, *A Complete View of Puseyism* (London, 1843), pp. 145 f.

## CHAPTER XV

### MYSTICISM AND SACRAMENTALISM

In the case of the Oxford Movement, as of other phenomena in religious history, the actual occurrence of the word 'mysticism' is seldom a sure criterion of the mystical type of piety in its deeper sense. Least of all perhaps is this the case with the only Tract which has mysticism in its title, and therefore became the object of suspicious attention. What Keble means by the *mysticism* he examines in the early Fathers is little more than a kind of symbolism, though he seems to postulate an objective connection between certain more generally applied symbols, and the spiritual realities they represent.[1] It is thus only an adaptation of the idea of nature's symbolic—or as sometimes it is called—sacramental character, that is a leading feature in Keble, which has its best known expression in 'The Christian Year': Nature is a word of God, in which all Christian Revelation is written for him who understands how to read it. It may be sufficient to call to mind that these thoughts on the one hand are based on Butler's philosophy, on the other on the Romanticism of which Wordsworth is the classical representative. We have already seen how the Oxford school loved to dwell on the thought of the infinite mysterious depth of spiritual reality, which could only approximately be expressed in the categories of the world of

[1] This applies at least to the imagery of the Bible. 'The Author of Scripture is the Author of Nature. He made His creatures what they are, upholds them in their being. . . . We know not how much there may be, far beyond mere metaphor and similitude, in His using the name of any one of His creatures, in a translated sense, to shadow out something invisible. But thus far we may seem to understand, that the object thus spoken of by Him is so far taken out of the number of ordinary figures of speech, and resources of language, and partakes henceforth of the nature of a type' (Keble, *On the Mysticism attributed to the Early Fathers of the Church*, Tract 89, p. 166).

sense. At times the dogmatism seems to be softened by this thought; no doubt we must all the more anxiously and intensely hold fast by the few distinguishable threads in the woof, but it is in the hope that the glory of the concealed pattern will far exceed every earthly imagination. Even the expressions of Scripture may thus become symbolic. Newman knows that the Biblical conception of the world, like the physical, is a *figure*, a mystery, a 'sacramental truth,' under whose outward form the invisible gift of grace is rather concealed than expressed.[1]

But all this is not mysticism in the deeper sense. It has been the object of the last chapter to show how the way to the land of purely mystical communion with God is laid down in the first instance, when the idea of grace as quasi-physical or substantial prevails over the purely personal idea, when the thought of infused grace drives out the imputed. But while Newman's dialectical explanation allows us to follow this very process, we have to look for the most genuine expression of mystical communion with God, not in him, but in the first instance in Pusey. That he is properly the *doctor mysticus* in earlier Neo-Anglicanism, has scarcely received sufficient notice from its historians. In his biography the multiplicity of trivial daily affairs has partly concealed this deep and genuine well-spring in the soul. But it seems to me of the greatest importance for comprehending the place of sacramental religion in Neo-Anglicanism.

It would take too long to try to work out the different ways in which the mystical vein in Pusey's religion was nourished. A certain guidance in the matter can be found in the quotations which interlard his sermons, and give them the character of learned dissertations. We have already noticed that the study of St. Augustine played an important part in Pusey's development. But in this respect, Augustine and the other Latin Fathers (Tertullian, Ambrose, Leo) served rather as a channel for the piety and theology of the Greek Church;

[1] He speaks in a wonderful sermon, 'Mysteries in Religion,' of the two worlds as 'two languages, or two separate approximations towards the awful unknown Truth,' but advises the faithful to keep to 'the figure given us in Scripture. . . . We will hold it as a Mystery, or (what was anciently called) a Truth Sacramental; that is, a high invisible grace lodged in an outward form' (*Parochial and Plain Sermons*, vol. ii. No. 18, p. 211).

and proof can be abundantly given, that Pusey in his preaching drew directly from Clement of Alexandria. Irenaeus, Gregory of Nazianzum, Chrysostom, Cyril, and others.[1] At times his instinct may lead him back to the chief source of the mysticism of the early Church, and make Plato himself speak.[2] But it is more interesting to discover that no mediaeval writer attracted his attention to the same degree as St. Bernard.[3] He was also familiar with Ruysbroek,[4] nor was Tauler unknown to him. In connection with the strong influence of recent Catholic piety, evidenced in the publication of works by Surin and Avrillon, comes an increased intimacy not merely with the modern Roman mystics like Blasius (often quoted in Leeds sermons), St. John of the Cross, St. Theresa, Nouet, Scupoli,[5] and others, but also with the mediaeval, such as Catherine of Siena, Thomas à Kempis, Bonaventura.[6] But it must be emphasised that Pusey is not content with the mere reproduction of the thoughts of older mystics, but lives independently in their world, and at times the rapture of the contemplation and reception of God breaks out through the awkward language, and creates expressions which might deserve a place among the writings of the classical mystics.

We have noticed already how the Evangelical and pietistic theology of the Cross occupies the central place in his teaching, and we have also seen indications of its mystical transformation and deepening. He points out himself in the preface to the English edition of Surin's 'Fondements de la vie spirituelle,' how through Evangelicalism 'a vivid and energetic, however partial, preaching of the corruption of human nature, and of the Cross, . . . by the Providence of God, broke in upon an age of torpor and smooth easy ways in

[1] See, *e.g.*, his sermon, 'Bliss of Heaven, We shall see Him as He is,' No. 16 in *Sermons preached in St. Saviour's, Leeds.*

[2] 'The soul of one who greatly loveth is much more in the heart it loveth than in itself' (*Sermons during the Season from Advent to Whitsuntide*, p. 336).

[3] See, *e.g.*, the quotations to a sermon, 'The Will of God, the Cure of Self-Will' (*ibid.* No. 23); and also Nos. 24 and 25.

[4] See, *e.g.*, preface to *Sermons during the Season from Advent to Whitsuntide*, p. xxi note, and *Leeds Sermons*, pp. 284, 301, etc.

[5] Pusey published some of his treatises in 1846: *The Spiritual Combat by Scupoli with the Path of Paradise or of Inward Peace* (in 1868 the sixteenth thousand of this book was printed, a striking evidence of the strong influence of such literature on Neo-Anglicanism).

[6] See especially the preface to Surin, *The Foundations of the Spiritual Life.*

religion,' and recognises the debt which 'Catholic' Neo-Anglicanism owes to the great 'revival of the previous century.'[1] From this he goes on to expound the preaching and contemplation of the Cross as the centre of Christianity, and especially as the only real aid to a true self-discipline, and he borrows Bonaventura's expression of the consummate bliss in contemplation of the suffering Saviour. For in the ineffable suffering is present the ineffable love: 'His Sacred Wounds have the capacity of His Godhead'[2]: they are the gate of Paradise, and the enraptured soul wishes it had been in the place of the lance, when it entered the Saviour's side. But such a contemplation of the sufferings has lost sight of the suffering Person, and His opened Side is the spring of infinite love. The more contemplation loses itself in and feasts upon the details of the Passion, the greater becomes the distance from the personal Saviour, every separate thing becomes merely a new door as it were to the depth of infinite unfathomable love.[3]

So the road from the mysticism of the Cross to the mysticism of infinity is shorter than may appear at first. In a sermon, 'Looking unto Jesus, the Groundwork of Penitence,'[4] Pusey maintains that the outward contemplation of the Passion cannot change the heart, unless 'He Himself kindle our hearts with His piercing look of love.' But this evangelical thought leads directly into a mystical

[1] See Surin, *The Foundations of the Spiritual Life*, pp. vi f. (ed. 1874). At the same time he dissociates himself from Wesleyanism, which system 'threatens to be one of the most dreadful scourges with which the Church was ever afflicted, the great antagonist of penitence.' By way of comparison we may recall Newman's estimate of Methodism: see especially his *Letter to the Bishop of Oxford* (Oxford, 1841), p. 38.

[2] *Ibid.* p. xxxiii.

[3] *Ibid.* p. xxxi. It is said of the Saints' contemplation of the Passion that 'each Wound had its own treasure-house of the depths of Divine Mercy—its own antidote to sin . . . chiefly were they ever drawn to the very Abyss of His unsearchable Love, His pierced Side, and His opened Heart, thus "to draw of the fountains of salvation." They wearied not of contemplating His Wounds, His Healing Stripes, His Words, because the unutterable love of which they were the tokens, being Infinite, there issues from them an infinite attractiveness of love.' Pusey characterises his own religion to a greater extent perhaps than he is himself aware when he makes a point against the Protestant doctrine of Atonement, that it 'concentrates attention on one side only, speaks of "Atonement" and the "Crucified," but tends to banish contemplation of the object' (p. xxix).

[4] *Sermons preached in St. Saviour's, Leeds*, No. 11, p. 177.

train of ideas. He must draw us—but not as heart draws heart, but by pouring into our hearts the power of His love; 'to lift us up from earth and earthly desires, with that cloud of witnesses, by whom we are surrounded, whom we this eve commemorate, the white-robed army of His redeemed, which ever followeth Him, drawn up by the Sun of Righteousness, away from the damp of this earth, gathering around Him, and glorified by His light, and reflecting it. . . . Himself, our Redeeming Lord, is that living Centre of our souls, the Sun of Righteousness, to whom all things are drawn, around Whom all things roll, to Whom all turn, from Whom all look for and have the glow of life and love, through which they live whom God brings back into the harmony of His Creation. Himself is the True Sun "from Whose heat nothing is hidden," in His new creation; Himself the hidden Magnet, Who having no Form or Beauty when He died for us, draws mightily to Himself all who have that which can be drawn, and drawing, holds them to Himself, imparting to them of the Virtue which goeth forth from Him, and thereby transforming them into Himself, so that the closer they are held to Him, the more of His Virtue floweth into them, and the more they receive of Him, the more do they by His indwelling Virtue cleave unto Him, upheld not of themselves but by His Spirit which dwelleth in them. He, through Whom are all things, Himself, through all—inspirations, Sacraments, hidden drawings, the yearnings and cravings of the soul, prayers, meditations, the Mysteries of His Incarnation, Life, Death and Resurrection, His Sufferings and His Glory—draweth all; Himself as God, the Beginning from Whom all things are, the End to Whom all things tend.' That we have here to deal with a piety of unmistakably mystic type, scarcely needs to be emphasised.

It is interesting to observe how Pusey, like other theologians of mystic tendencies,[1] was conscious of the danger that this piety, through which the Divine so easily gets something of the character of infinite substance, may end in Pantheism. In the preface (1848) to 'Sermons during the Season from

[1] F. von Hügel on 'Mysticism and Pantheism,' in chap. xiv. of *The Mystical Element of Religion as Studied in St. Catherine of Genoa and her Friends* (London, 1908), vol. ii.

Advent to Whitsuntide,' which aims at inculcating the Divine indwelling in man, he is specially concerned with meeting the view that the doctrine of 'the participation of the Divine nature' (2 St. Peter i. 4) leads to Pantheism.[1] Only such a union with God is Pantheistic, in which the soul loses itself, its own existence, when absorbed into the Divine Being. 'Yet so does the soul of man long for union with God, that if the truth is withheld from it, it will seek, by way of imagination or of heresy, Him, Whom ignorantly (St. Paul tells us) and blindly human nature "feels after," "though He be not far from every one of us."'[2] Thus Pantheism has broken out in Mohammedanism and 'a certain fervour (however lacking in humility) of Sufic poetry also shows that it has more semblance of love than Rationalism or Socinianism.' This is highly characteristic: even the Sufic form of Pantheism has really more attraction to Pusey than the watered-down form of prophetic religion which he refers to under the name of Socinianism or Rationalism.

Though in the orthodox doctrine of the Incarnation Pusey sees the only safeguard against Pantheism, though he is constantly inclined to put his own yearning for God and enjoyment of Him into the mould of the theology of the Cross, his piety shows plainly enough the distinguishing marks of the mysticism of the Infinite. The object is the Presence of God, of Christ in the soul. The way goes through moral action, but chiefly through self-denial, which in the mystical scale of values takes on a passive nature, becomes self-emptying and suffering quietude. 'Only desire to empty thy soul of all which is not He; and He, as and when He seeth best for thee, will dwell in thee richly, and will

[1] He sees in Pantheism one of the most dangerous enemies to Christianity, and traces its rise to Lutheran Germany, but he does not venture to say 'how far the Eutychianism of Luther in his theory as to the Holy Eucharist may have contributed to it (for Eutychianism is Pantheistic in its characteristic heresy)' (*ibid.* p. xix). By Luther's Eutychianism is meant of course the doctrine of *ubiquitas carnis Christi*. That Pusey ventures on such a statement is sufficient to show how little he comprehended the essential features of the most prominent champion of personal religion in Church history. Pusey's self-defence was the more called for, as Hampden in his Bampton Lectures had represented the mediaeval mystics as Pantheistic, and the doctrine of participation in the Divine Nature as leading to Pantheism.

[2] Preface, p. xxi.

give thee, not thy lost Graces only . . . but the Infinite Love of God; yea, Himself Who is Love.'[1] Obedience is essentially the passive resting in God's Will. 'To suffer the Will of God is the surest, deepest, safest way to learn to do it. For it has least of self. It needeth only to be still; and it reposeth at once in the Loving Will of God. If we have crippled ourselves, and cannot do great things, we can, at least, meekly bear chastening, hush our souls, and be still.'[2] And in stillness and simplicity one comes nearest to God. 'Blessed are those holy hours in which the soul retires from the world to be alone with God. God's voice, as Himself, is everywhere. Within and without He speaks to our souls, if we would hear. Only the din of the world or the tumult of our own hearts, deafens our inward ear to it. Stillness is as His very Presence, for, like the prayer for the Prophet's servant (2 Kings vi. 17), it opens our senses to perceive what was there to behold, only our eyes were holden.' All God's works witness of Him. 'But chiefly in the inmost soul He speaks, because there He dwells.'[3] And with an echo of a thought of Wordsworth, who was dear to all the Oxford men, he distinguishes in the tender look of the infant, 'as it gazes with such fixed, placid, loving earnestness on something we see not,' a parallel to the innate longing of man for God.

Here as elsewhere the chief aim of mystic piety is to lose itself into God, to let itself be carried away by the strong flood of the Divine, to sink in its sea. He says of the blessed, that 'He, the Fountain of all good, shall overstream them with the Torrent of His Pleasure, and enfold them and fill them with His Love, and irradiate them with His Light. Their Being shall be His Being, and they shall be themselves,

[1] *Op. cit.* p. 268. Even the desire for God is the first symptom of His Presence: 'Thou couldst not desire Him, but for His Presence in thy soul' (p. 267).

[2] *Ibid.* p. 367. In this sermon, 'The Will of God, the Cure of Self-Will,' which overflows with quotations from St. Augustine, and still more from St. Bernard, we find the following expression for the mystic union of wills: 'I, and thou, stand, as it were, over against each other, I, this worm of earth, yet endowed with what even God will not break, that fearful gift, the Will: Thou, the Fountain of Love, of Wisdom, Overflowing Goodness. I who am nothing; Thou Who Alone art. Give but thy will to God and *I* and *Thou* become one' (p. 375); cp. *ibid.* p. 357: 'Seek to wean thine own soul more and more from all which is not God.'

[3] *Ibid.* p. 193 (a sermon entitled 'God's Presence in Loneliness').

only to be not themselves, only that there may be beings, to be for ever filled with the Thrilling, Pure, Holy, Exstatic, Love of God. They shall be out of themselves in the Absorbing Love of God, and God, in His boundless Love, shall dwell in them.'[1] Perhaps still more strongly the yearning for the infinite comes out in one of the Leeds Sermons, 'Bliss of Heaven, We shall be like Him.' 'Oh deep Ocean of joy and bliss and love, wherein we shall ever freely range, ever longing yet ever satisfied; ever filled yet never sated; ever loving yet never weary; ever receiving fresh streams of love and glory and bliss from the exhaustless Fountain of all Good, which is God.'[2] Similar expressions abound in another patristic sermon in the same collection on the beatific Vision of God, 'Bliss of Heaven, We shall see Him as He is': without Him we cannot have strength to bear the sight of Him, who 'dwelleth in light, yea, He Himself is that Surpassing, Unbounded, Uncreated, Ineffable Light, wherein He dwelleth, for He who is not in space, nor bounded, can dwell in nothing but Himself, only by His entrance into us can we see Him.'[3] (Pusey applies here the image of iron that glows in the fire, which according to him first occurs in Cyril of Jerusalem.) Thus the vision of God becomes only one side of the being taken up into God, of His complete communication of Himself.[4]

[1] *Op. cit.* p. 119.

[2] Similar expressions, though perhaps of less intensely mystical character for the blessedness of communion with God, are to be found in Newman—*e.g.* 'We have been . . . brought into . . . that mysterious Presence of God, which encompasses us, which is in us, and around us, which enfolds us, as though with a robe of light, hiding our scarred and discoloured souls from the sight of Divine Purity, and making them shining as the Angels: and which flows in upon us by means of all forms of beauty which this visible world contains' (*Parochial and Plain Sermons*, vol. iv. p. 228).

[3] *Leeds Sermons*, p. 273. Here Pusey quotes from many Fathers, and even Dionysius Areopagita: 'Invisible is He for the excellence of His Brightness, and unapproachable through the exceeding abundance of the outpouring of His supersubstantial Light.'

[4] 'O what shall be the bliss of those who shall enter into that boundless ocean of everlasting joy, that Goodness which is the source of all Good, that beauty of which all things fair are but the shadow, and hide It from us rather than reveal it . . . to behold in His Own Wisdom, the cause of all things that have ever been . . . to behold His Own Love, the Love wherewith He hath loved us' (*ibid.* p. 281).

It is important to show that this deep mysticism of the infinite is contained, as it were concentrated and fused, in faith in Christ. The whole idea of the Incarnation, like the contemplation of the Cross, becomes a door to the immeasurable, blessed depth of the Divine. We have previously noticed the inclination to maintain the Divinity of Christ to a degree which seems at times to border on Apollinarianism, to maintain that it is Almighty God Who is present in the manger as on the Cross.[1] And it is actually the indwelling of the Divine Nature in the human, which makes the Incarnation the foundation of Christian faith; for it is the condition of the divine nature being also infused into our human natures. 'As Man, He received the Holy Spirit, that He might again dwell in man, clothe us with the Robe of supernatural Grace and Holiness, which we lost in Adam, and were found naked. For our sakes He sanctified Himself, that we also might be sanctified by the Truth. He sanctified His Human Nature by His indwelling Godhead, that so He might sanctify our nature by Himself, Who is the Word of Truth.'[2] He came 'to restore to us a more than Angel nature, to Deify our nature by His Own indwelling.'[3] This is the chief fruit of His redeeming work, for we can only dwell in God, by His indwelling in us.'[4] And 'by dwelling in us He makes us part of Himself.'[5] Instances of how Pusey constantly returns to the thought of Divine indwelling in us, can be endlessly multiplied. God is 'with us' by His union with our nature, by His indwelling in us.[6] 'It is not enough for His Love to give us any or all the gifts of His Grace; not enough to give us His Love and Righteousness and Sanctification and Redemption; but He is Himself all these and all besides to us.'[7] 'He would be Himself the very Life of our souls, Himself the Love, wherewith we love Himself; Himself the Righteousness, through Whose Presence we

[1] Cp. *Leeds Sermons*, p. 297.

[2] Pusey, *Sermons during the Season from Advent to Whitsuntide* (an Easter sermon on 'The Christian's Life in Christ'), p. 232.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 204. [4] *Ibid.* p. 232. [5] *Ibid.* p. 333.

[6] *Ibid.* p. 45; cp. p. 43: 'He Who took flesh in the Virgin's womb and dwelt among us, will dwell anew in these our houses of clay.'

[7] *Ibid.* ('The Christian the Temple of God') p. 345.

keep His commandments ; Himself the Holiness whereby we are holy.'[1]

Just as the Incarnation was a taking up of manhood into God,[2] so also God's indwelling in us through Christ implies that we are raised into the sphere of the Divine, taken up into God's Nature. The Presence of God's Spirit is the first-fruits of Heaven.[3] Our bodies will be re-created after the pattern of Christ's glorified Body through the transforming power of the indwelling Spirit, so that we shall be able to see God, hear our Lord's Voice, taste God's sweetness all through Him, through our being taken up into Him : 'In this ocean of bliss, surely it is the very bliss of bliss, that it shall not be by any power of our own, that we shall enjoy that bliss but through the inflow of Divine Love ; that it shall be, not out of God but in God, that we shall see, hear, feel God.'[4]

He who is wont continually to seek in the phenomena of the world of sense types and symbols of spiritual realities, must thereby be led to a high estimate of the *verba visibilia* of Christian Tradition : sacraments become natural, because all nature has a sacramental character. But the line of piety we have just followed points still more emphatically in the same direction : if the grace which is to flow into us, and fill us, has anything of the character of substance, if it can raise our nature into the super-nature of the Divine, this must happen through natural vehicles, which by their very existence witness how the Divine Super-nature has entered into the human nature. So much the more, as one merely needed to follow the early Fathers, from whom one had received already the idea of mystic communion with God, and the idea of infused Grace, and whose authority was already in-

[1] *Op. cit.* p. 348. With the thought of God's indwelling in the Christian as His temple belong of course the requirement of holiness and the mystical self-emptying. Cp. p. 54 : 'We cannot hallow ourselves, but we can, by His Grace, put off things unholy. We cannot fit ourselves for His indwelling, but we can, through Him, cast out all idols from our hearts, His Temple, that they offend not His Holy Eyes ; we cannot fill ourselves, but we can, by His Goodness, empty ourselves of all the lusts of the flesh, the lust of the eye, the pride of life. . . . We need but bring Him of our emptiness, and He will give us of His fulness.'

[2] *Leeds Sermons*, p. 293 ; *ibid.* p. 53.

[3] *Sermons during the Season from Advent to Whitsuntide*, p. 354.

[4] *Leeds Sermons*, p. 302.

culcated by the static theory of the Church. So much the more, as the old doctors of High Anglicanism, themselves drawing on the ideas of the early Church, here set an example. Thus the Romantic temper and the intensive religious development combine with the forces of tradition and doctrinal authority to make the inward spiritual development of the whole Oxford Movement result in a sacramental form of religion.

Almost at every point, where Pusey is occupied with the indwelling of the Divine, he goes on to point to the sacraments as the means for its attainment. If our justification is the appropriation of the glory of the Risen Lord, the sacraments are 'the channels whereby . . . He conveys these exceeding Gifts to us. They are His Death and Life in one. . . . All which we have, we have in Him, by being made members of Him. And members of Him we are made and preserved through His Sacraments. The one ingrafteth us into, the other maketh us, what in It is given to the faithful, the Body of Christ.'[1]

Though the lines of thought we have just followed involuntarily lead to the Eucharist, we must first deal with the doctrine of Baptism which is essential to the comprehension of Tractarianism, especially in its early phases. We have seen that Baptismal Regeneration was from the first a watchword, and thus that Baptism becomes the vehicle of Justification in Newman's Anglican dogmatics.

During the first decades of the nineteenth century, the question of Baptismal Regeneration had become the subject of a lively discussion. It was the Evangelical preaching of conversion and amendment which gave this doctrine its interest as the chief dividing line between an objective and a subjective form of religion. Earlier within the Church, both the High Church School with its Sacramental tendency, and the Arminian, had been able to express its thoughts in the words of the Articles and the Liturgy, though there is an undeniable difference

[1] *Sermons during the Season from Advent to Whitsuntide*, p. 220; cp. p. 55. Newman in his sermon on 'Baptism' (1835, *Parochial and Plain Sermons*, vol. iii. No. 19, p. 278) speaks of the Sacraments of the Church as vehicles of a spiritual power, in contrast to their Jewish prototypes: 'and these mysteries are not mere outward signs, but (as it were) effluences of His Grace developing themselves in external forms, as Angels might do when they appeared to men.'

between talking, as Bishop Bull does,[1] of Baptismal Regeneration as being made to participate in the Divine Nature, and interpreting the 'grafting into Christ' of which the Articles speak, as merely the adoption into the Visible Church, a formal new birth, which is little more than a phrase, and to be distinguished from inward renewal.[2] Later High Churchmanship, to which 'Baptismal Regeneration' was important as a guarantee of objective religion against Evangelicalism, built in the main on Waterland's coldly orthodox formulation, which scarcely excludes either of the two interpretations referred to.[3]

At the beginning of the nineteenth century, the chief champion of the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration was R. Mant (later Bishop of Down, Connor, and Dromore), who in his Bampton Lectures, 'An Appeal to the Gospel' (1812), had made Baptism the vehicle of Justification.[4]

It throws a peculiar light on the actuality of these ideas, that even before Baptismal Regeneration had through the 'Tracts for the Times' become a burning question, Edward Irving had made a strongly objective and sacramental position on this point one of the chief features of his preaching, in which the Apocalyptic side is combined with an ecclesiastical traditionalism and a high view of the ministry, which has a striking likeness to that of the Oxford Movement.[5] With him too a deep conviction of the reality of the Incarnation was the presupposition of sacramentalism. To him forgiveness

[1] Quoted in Tract No. 76; *Catena Patrum.* II. *Testimony of Writers in the Later English Church to the Doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration*, p. 33; cp. *ibid.*, quotation from Beveridge, p. 39: 'Neither doth the Spirit of Christ only follow upon, but certainly accompanies the Sacrament of Baptism.'

[2] See W. Goode, *The Doctrine of the Church of England as to the Effects of Baptism in the Case of Infants* (London, 1849), p. 444. It is typical that the author could draw up his own *Catena patrum*, partly with quotations drawn from the writers quoted in Tract No. 76, to prove an opposite view.

[3] Tract 76, p. 46. Waterland distinguishes between a passive and an active regeneration, also between regeneration and renovation (*Regeneration Stated and Explained according to Scripture and Antiquity* (*Works*: Oxford, 1823), vol. iv. p. 346.

[4] Storr, *Development of English Theology*, p. 76; cp. Goode, *op. cit.* p. 486. Mant had also taught Baptismal Regeneration in one of the S.P.C.K. Tracts, in connection with which certain earlier Tracts issued by the Society, maintaining an opposite view, were either suppressed or corrected.

[5] Oliphant, *Life of Edward Irving, illustrated by his Journals and Correspondence* (4th ed., London, 1815); Th. Kolde, *Edward Irving. Ein biographischer Essay* (Leipzig, 1901).

of sins and the indwelling of the Holy Spirit are the real consequences of Baptism—though with him the former is more in the forefront than in the Oxford Movement.[1] Baptism involves a real ingrafting into Christ. 'From the moment of Baptism and ever onward till the separation of soul and body, we ought to look upon our body as a pure and cleansed substance inhabited by the Holy Ghost, and by Him empowered to live the life of Christ and keep the commandments of God blameless.'[2] We may also in this connection mention how in other quarters too, during the religious movements of the nineteenth century, which were fertilised by Romanticism, kindred thoughts occur of Baptism as the instrument of objective Grace. I will mention only one name, that of Grundtvig.[3]

In Newman's personal development this question was decisive; his acceptance of the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration indicates his defection from Evangelicalism. It was chiefly Hawkins who influenced him in the matter, but strangely enough Newman states that it was by putting into his hands a work of evangelical colour, 'Apostolical Preaching,' by J. B. Sumner, who later as Archbishop of Canterbury was to incur the exasperation of High Churchmen by refusing to condemn Gorham of heresy in the matter of Baptismal Regeneration.[4] The conception of the doctrine held by Hawkins and the older Oriel school was certainly of the chilly objective, rather than of the purely sacramental type. Thus it was as a safeguard of the objective view of the Church that the doctrine first obtained importance for the Oxford Movement. That if consistently developed from this point of view it must lead to insoluble contradictions, since the sacramental validity of Baptism, according to the view which won the day in the early Church, was independent of the ministry—even the baptism of heretics was valid—they seem never to have fully

[1] E. Irving, *Homilies on the Sacraments* (London, 1828), vol. i., 'On Baptism' p. 434 ff.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 435.

[3] For Grundtvig's view of the objective regeneration in Baptism see his sermon, 'Troen og Daaben' in *Christelige Praedikener eller Söndags-Bog* (Copenhagen, 1827), vol. ii. pp. 246 f.

[4] *Letters and Correspondence*, vol. i. p. 119 (ed. 1903, p. 105); *Apologia*, p. 8 (ed. 1908).

realised.[1] But the view of Baptism soon underwent an ethical and religious deepening.

One of the consequences of this doctrine that was most important to Tractarian piety was the resulting view of sin after Baptism. Baptism alone imparts a fully effective forgiveness of sins. He who has stained the white robe of his Baptism can never entirely regain it.[2] This contributes to intensify the feeling of anxious attention to one's own life, of scrupulous and trembling exactitude, which we found to form a fundamental element in Tractarian piety. Linked with this are also the thoughts which (*e.g.* in Froude) occasionally appear about the possibility of a perfect life. Examples are numerous, but it may be enough here to recall how Newman on 'his Anglican death-bed,' when he had a keener eye for superficiality in many of his earlier associates, and demands a stricter religion, sees the chief error in the neglect of the doctrine of post-baptismal sin.[3] But in connection with this there is a deepening of the purely sacramental idea of Baptism as a means to the indwelling of God and the infused Grace. Both these aspects, as the Tractarian doctrine of Baptism in general, are expounded by Pusey in his 'Scriptural Views of Holy Baptism,'[4] in a manner which became a definite feature of the whole school, and is echoed in wellnigh all the sermons on Baptism.[5]

[1] This question is touched on by Pusey in Tract No. 67 (4th ed.), p. 240, but he does not seem to be aware of its importance and its consequences.

[2] See Pusey in a sermon, 'God's Glories in Infants, set forth in the Holy Innocents,' in *Plain Sermons*, vol. iii. p. 272: 'Some, it is hoped, in every congregation have yet in the main the innocency once bestowed upon them; and if most of us have too probably tarnished our baptismal purity, have in different degrees stained the white robe given us, and cannot for the most part pretend to the blessedness of those "who have not defiled their garments, and they shall walk with Me in white, for they are worthy," but most have lost some portion of their crown; yet to all is something left. If we have not the original purity of our white robes, we may wash their spots with our tears, and He will cleanse them with His Precious Blood.'

[3] Newman's *Correspondence with Keble and Others* (September 12, 1842): 'There will be no good . . . anywhere till the doctrine of post-baptismal sin is recognised.'

[4] Tracts Nos. 67, 68, 69. Of these three only No. 67 was issued in a new edition, with alterations (1839, 1840, and 1842), the last with title 'The Doctrine of the Holy Baptism as contained in the Scripture, and thence enlarged upon by the Fathers' (Liddon, *Life of Pusey*, vol. i. p. 352).

[5] Among earlier pronouncements on baptismal doctrine we need only refer to Newman's sermons, 'Regenerating Baptism' and 'Infant Baptism,' in *Parochial and Plain Sermons*, vol. iii. Nos. 19 and 20.

It is scarcely necessary for our purpose to enter upon an analysis of Pusey's essay, which is ponderous both in form and content. The purely historical matter consisting of polemics against the reformed—especially Zwingli's—view of Baptism, while Luther in this respect (viz. the character of Baptism as a mystical putting on of Christ) wins the author's approval, and the elaborate patristic citations,—all this we have to put aside, merely to bring out two chief points, which, though brought into close connection with each other by Pusey, yet represent the two opposite poles of the Oxford Movement: on the one hand Baptism as an objectively effective means of grace, on the other its mystical content as an incorporation in Christ, a partaking of His Death and Resurrection.

It is the former point of view which is expressed in the formula 'baptismal regeneration.' Even if Baptism is not expressly stated in Scripture to be the instrument of regeneration, it is combined with it in a way which suggests this conclusion.[1] So Baptism effects not merely an outward change, but the birth of the inward life, 'a new, real, though not merely physical beginning—an existence real, though invisible—and though worked by an unseen Agent, yet (when not stifled) felt in its effects, like the energy of the viewless winds.' No subjective change can be compared with the birth from above, given by Baptism: 'It is not only the creation of a new heart, new affections, new desires, and as it were, a new birth, but is an *actual* birth from above, or from God, a gift coming down from God, and given to faith, through Baptism; yet not the work of Faith, but the operation of "water and the Holy Ghost," the Holy Spirit giving us a new life, in the fountain opened by Him, and we being born therein of Him, even as our Blessed and Incarnate Lord was, according to the flesh, born of Him in the Virgin's womb.'

No doubt faith and penitence are conditions of the gift, good works and a new life its consequences, but in itself Baptism is 'the gift of God, not to be confounded with or restrained to any of its fruits (as a change of heart, or conversion), but illimitable and incomprehensible, as that great

[1] Tract No. 67 (4th ed.), p. 25.

mystery from which it flows, the Incarnation of our Redeemer, the Ever-blessed Son of God.'[1] Here the objective ecclesiastical standpoint is formulated with all desirable energy, and also in other passages comes out with great clearness. Baptism is a Sacrament, in that it gives something in itself, in contrast to the Protestant view, which makes the faith of the right recipient the consecrating principle, and that which really 'brings down Christ to the heart of each individual.'[2] The consequence of this doctrine is, that Infant Baptism cannot be a Sacrament at all, as the real consecrating principle is lacking in it. In opposition to this Pusey does not shrink from calling Baptism an *opus operatum*; but regards himself sufficiently protected against Rome by adding that this only expresses one side of it. As regards Infant Baptism, the essence of the Sacrament certainly does not depend on the faith of the recipient, the Grace it offers is as real even if the recipient is not prepared; but it is not made ineffective by the absence of individual faith in the child; for, according to the doctrine of antiquity, it receives this grace by virtue of the faith of the Church.[3] This makes the objectivity complete, as the same Divine Institution, which administers the means of Grace, can supply the individual conditions for its right reception. It was the error of modern times to have removed the centre of gravity from God to man, when in the actions whereby He infuses into us as a life-giving power participation in Christ's Cross and Resurrection, they only see outward motives, which in a natural manner like other motives affect the will.[4]

The gift of Baptism is thus, though fundamentally one, yet twofold: the complete forgiveness of sins and union with

[1] *Op. cit.* p. 47. Newman in a sermon, 'The Gift of the Spirit' (*Parochial and Plain Sermons*, vol. iii. No. 18, p. 266), says that the Christian Church possesses 'an especial glory' and 'dreadfulness,' and that this glory comes to the Christian in Baptism: 'By this new-birth the Divine Shekinah is set up within him, pervading soul and body.'

[2] Tract No. 69, p. 176.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 153. It should be emphasised that thus Pusey seems to be unaffected by the later Catholic doctrine of *infusio fidei* by Baptism, which also recurs in Luther in *De Captivitate Babylonica* (W.A., vol. vi. p. 538), here combined with the faith of the offering Church: 'per orationem Ecclesiae offerentis et credentis, cui omnia possibilia sunt, et parvulus fide infusa mutatur et renovatur.'

[4] Tract No. 67 (4th ed.), pp. 91 f.

Christ. No doubt the sin-effacing work of Baptism is not sharply limited to the actual moment of its reception, but apart from Baptism, there is given no 'complete washing away' of sins in this life.[1] Every sin after Baptism weakens the effect of the grace of Baptism, and he who has once fallen from this grace can nevermore reach the same position as he who has kept the white robe of Baptism unspotted.[2] We have already seen how this view contributed to intensify the seriousness of the sense of sin in Tractarian piety, and produced a peculiarly accentuated feeling of penitence, the close kinship of which with Evangelical religion is not cancelled by the difference of dogmatic basis.[3] Perhaps this only restores to the Tractarian preaching a depth and earnestness which the later form of Evangelicalism had lost.[4]

But the high value attached to penitence, which seems a consequence of it, puts Pusey in a difficulty, which is not merely of logical and formal character; it is as much a question of an insuperable opposition between the two chief elements of his own piety. The difficulty is not diminished by the patristic material which is brought to bear, since the static view of the primitive Church makes the author blind to the contrasts and development contained therein. It is typical that, among the authorities, Hermas' conception of penance is quoted; in some respects it may be very near to the Tractarian; penance exists, but only as an exceptional expedient for those who could not keep their robes pure, which to the Tractarians, as to the early Church, was not merely an ideal but in some measure a possibility; but he who has soiled it by post-baptismal sin had recourse to repentance and penance, but only as a 'plank after

[1] Tract No. 68, p. 63. [2] *Ibid.* pp. 48, 53.

[3] It may be a fact that Pusey's emphasis on the doctrine of 'post-baptismal sin' powerfully contributed to awakening within the Church the spirit of penitence (see Liddon's *Life of Pusey*, vol. iii. p. 371).

[4] Pusey's view is that the Church of his time has lost 'that knowledge of the reality and hatefulness of sins, and of self as a deserter of God, that vivid perception of Heaven and Hell, of the essential and eternal contrast between God and Satan, sin and holiness, and of the dreadful danger of having again fallen into the kingdom of darkness, after having been brought into that of light, and God's dear Son—it is this we have lost . . . We are in a lethargy . . . until we lay deeper the foundations of repentance, the very preaching of the Cross of Christ becomes but a means of carnal security' (Tract No. 60, p. 62).

shipwreck.'[1] But on the other hand Pusey is apparently inclined to maintain a high estimate of conversion, though he will not use of it the expression 'regeneration.' It has not Baptism's power of a sudden change, of supernatural new-birth; but it is a slow process, which can only partly restore the 'health of Baptism.'[2]

To illustrate the impossibility of a repetition of Baptism, the patristic argument is quoted that such a repetition would be 'to crucify the Son of God afresh.'[3] This expression leads straight to the mystical view of Baptism, which in Pusey goes side by side with the objectively institutional view, without their inconsistency being consciously felt by him. To him, certainly, the deepest value of Baptism consists in the fact that it 'grafts into the Body of Christ,' not merely as a form of incorporation into the visible Church, but by making the soul one with the Saviour, a participator of His Death and Resurrection. When he makes his own and assents to the patristic explanations of the words of St. Paul about Baptism as being buried with Christ and rising with Him, it is not merely an impersonal repetition, but his interpretations are in deep unison with his own religious main position.[4] Baptism is the most inward union with the Lord's Crucifixion. 'It were much, to be buried, to be crucified with Him, like Him, but it is more to become partaker of His Burial and Crucifixion; to be (so to speak) co-interred, co-crucified; to be included in, wrapt round, as it were, in His Burial and Crucifixion, and gathered into His very Tomb.'[5] And this is,

[1] Tract No. 60, p. 70. Against this see Luther in *De Captivitate Babylonica* (W.A., vol. vii. p. 529): 'Simul vide quam periculosum, immo falsum sit opinari, poenitentiam esse secundam tabulam post naufragium, et quam perniciosus est error putare per peccatum excidisse vim baptismi et navem hanc esse illisam.'

[2] Pusey, *ibid.* p. 71. While penance cannot efface the marks of sin, Baptism is the putting on of the new man (p. 56). Real penance and repentance are no easy matter, as he shows by quotations, especially from Tertullian.

[3] *Ibid.* pp. 50 f.

[4] Here the agreement with Luther is striking; cp. *De Captivitate Babylonica* (W.A., vol. vi. p. 534): 'Quod ergo baptismo tribuitur ablutio a peccatis, vere quidem tribuitur, sed lentior et mollior est significatio quam ut baptismum exprimat, qui potius mortis et resurrectionis symbolum est . . . Peccator enim non tam ablui quam mori debet, ut totus renovetur in aliam creaturam, et ut morti ac resurrectioni Christi respondeat.'

[5] Tract No. 67 (4th ed.), p. 95.

according to St. Paul, what happens in Baptism, that we are ingrafted in His Death, and then our old man hangs upon His Cross. 'There is a marked identification with our Lord; and so, also, our walking in newness of life, is not the result of any motive, however persuasive, but 'the Power of His Resurrection.'

It is doubtless in agreement with the mystical temper (not without a certain Quietistic feature, which gives to these thoughts their special content) that man's passivity in Baptism is emphasised: it is altogether God's work and gift, the influx of His riches. 'We had no more to do with it than a man hath with burying or crucifying himself, much less could we join ourselves in our Saviour's Death, or include ourselves in His Cross; but we gave up ourselves only to God, for Him to work this in us, and He "by Baptism," the Apostle says, wrought it.'[1] The words, putting on Christ, becoming His members, being in Him, have to Pusey something of the same reality doubtless they had from the first on the lips of the Apostles. 'But the words thus acquire a very awful meaning; for if the having put on Christ, the being clothed with Him, makes us sons of God, then it makes us so, in that we are "made members of Christ" and "sons of God," because members of His Ever-Blessed Son; *i.e.* whoever of us has been baptized was thereby incorporated into Christ, and so being made a portion and a member of the Son of God, partakes of that Sonship, and is himself a Child of God, so that henceforth the Father looks upon him, not as what he is in himself, but as in, and a part of, His well-beloved Son, and loves him with a portion of that ineffable love with which He loves His Son.'[2] And so this union with God in Christ through Baptism is above all the gift of God. And so it is a false spirituality, which by its contempt for externals robs God's gift of its objectivity. The criticism of 'legal' ordinances itself puts a law in the place of the free gift of grace.

It is worthy of observation how far such a position is from any doctrine of merit, how Sacramentalism aims to the utmost at maintaining the objectivity and freedom of Divine grace, at representing man as the recipient alone with exclusion of all subjective conditions, which only too easily may encroach

[1] Tract No. 67, p. 96. [2] *Ibid.* p. 112.

on the sphere that in the world of intensive religion belongs only to the Great Giver. Pusey's view of Baptism is also without doubt most closely allied to that of St. Paul, and it is to that he adapts his patristic quotations. It is true that here again he was not aware of the development in the view of the early Church or the antithesis within it. But he seems instinctively to have shrunk from letting himself be led into the whole harshness of the Augustinian view of Baptism, as he is quite aloof from later Roman developments on this point. Probably he is nearest to the early Lutheran view of Baptism, though here, too, the characteristic opposition must not be overlooked. In Luther the objectivity of Baptism comes out still more strongly; it is as immovable as God's promise, and remains through life as the irrevocable pledge of His gracious Will.

In spite of these tendencies to break through the static frame even in the conception of Baptism, yet, as has been already stated, the central place of Baptism is significant of an earlier phase of Tractarianism when 'baptismal regeneration' still had a special and living meaning, as a hall-mark to distinguish it from Evangelicalism. But in proportion as the mystical view wins ascendency, it is bound to put in the forefront the Sacrament in which was seen the channel for the ever-renewed influx of Divine Grace. Baptism was thus once for all bound to a point in the past; the spiritual food of the Eucharist strengthened the pilgrim of progressive piety at every step of his journey.

Equally with Baptism the Tractarian view of the Eucharist has its roots in the old Anglican tradition.[1] Even on the threshold of Caroline High-Anglicanism, Bishop Andrewes in his sermons shows how the thought of the Divine indwelling, which gives its special character to one of the most wonderful prayers of the Anglican Liturgy, is at the bottom of this view of the Eucharist, is wedded to a quasi-physical conception of Grace, and is closely connected with the idea of the Incarnation. Thus the Eucharist is to Andrewes a means of participating in the Divine Nature, means of a

[1] A thorough and complete orientation of the Anglican doctrine of the Eucharist has been given by Darwell Stone, *A History of the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist* (2 vols., London, 1909).

'Divine indwelling' in man 'whereby He might dwell in us, and we in Him; He taking our flesh, and we receiving His Spirit; by His flesh, which He took of us, receiving His Spirit, which He imparteth to us; that as He through ours became *consors humanae naturae*, so we by His might become *consortes divinae naturae*.'[1] Christ is to Andrewes present in the Sacrament, just as at the Incarnation He was present in the manger; the Eucharist is thus for Him in a certain sense a sacrifice (just as the Anglican Liturgy says), but by way of answer to Rome he takes up the standpoint which later becomes typical of High-Anglicanism—that of emphasising the Real Presence of Christ as a fact, but abstaining from explaining the manner of His Presence.[2] This standpoint is taken up and developed later by Laud in direct polemic against the doctrine of Transubstantiation, but with energetic maintenance of 'the true substantial Presence of Christ.'[3] A certain divergence, however, makes its appearance between this school of Laud, which could scarcely have wished to make the Real Presence depend on any subjective conditions, and a more receptionist view, which is represented, *e.g.* by Thomas Morton († 1659 as Bishop of Durham),[4] and Thomas Jackson († 1632 as President of C.C.C., Oxford)[5]; even Hammond († 1660, imprisoned during the Commonwealth period) in theory is on the same side.[6]

Though the alterations in the Book of Common Prayer, made in 1662, further accentuated the Real Presence, yet a receptionist view was not excluded,[7] and even in Cosin, who nevertheless maintains the Eucharist to be a 'commemorative sacrifice,' the Real Presence is limited to the souls of those who come in faith and rightly prepared.[8] Also Jeremy Taylor's theoretical doctrine of the Eucharist seems to be of like nature; but by virtue of greater mystical depth, a

[1] Quoted from Stone, *op. cit.* vol. ii. p. 256.
[2] *Ibid.* vol. ii. p. 264.
[3] *Ibid.* vol. ii. p. 268.
[4] *Ibid.* vol. ii. p. 283.
[5] *Ibid.* vol. ii. p. 293.
[6] *Ibid.* vol. ii. p. 297.
[7] Though it can be said of these changes, as of those made in 1604 in the Catechism, that they 'incline towards the doctrine that the Body and Blood are present in the Sacrament at consecration and before reception' (*ibid.* vol. ii. p. 354), on the other hand a purely Calvinistic view did not lack representatives (*e.g.* J. Hales), but even the Westminster Catechism did not abandon the Receptionist view.
[8] *Ibid.* vol. ii. p. 322.

concentration on the connection of the Eucharist with the Incarnation, and a plain kinship with the Alexandrian theology, he is in this, as in other respects, one of the worthiest representatives of Caroline Anglicanism. The same features also characterise Ken's view of the Eucharist. Bull and Beveridge are near to him, though somewhat differing from each other on this point. The highest point in pre-Tractarian Anglicanism is found in the Non-Jurors : their view was expressed in a work by John Johnson, the very title of which shows its tendency : 'The Unbloody Sacrifice and Altar, Unveiled and Supported, in which the Nature of the Eucharist is explained according to the Sentiments of the Christian Church in the Four First Centuries' (1st edition of 1714).[1] Law's mystical piety was fed by this view of the Eucharist.[2] Even in the hymns of the brothers Wesley there is an echo at times of the Sacramental views which were so important to the piety of their youth. While Waterland in this, as in the question of Baptism, follows a sort of middle path of normal theology, all the deepest notes of High-Anglican Eucharistic devotion more richly than ever before the Oxford Movement, are to be heard in the 'forerunner of Neo-Anglicanism,' Alexander Knox.[3]

We have already seen how he connects the Eucharistic doctrine of the English Church with the earlier Catholic teaching (before the appearance of the dogma of Transubstantiation), and how among the Reformers he saw in Ridley the spokesman of a deeper sacramental view than that of Cranmer. But what is specially important for our purpose is the deep mystical idea to which he gives expression, which derives its force from the thought of the union of the Eucharist with the Incarnation, its mediation of the 'special influences of the incarnate Godhead.' He assumes thus a quasi-physical conception of Grace : 'And when we believe . . . that He, who was God over all, united Himself to so low a thing as flesh, to be the source of these influences, we surely need not question the credibility of His conveying these influences, through any other work of His

[1] *Op. cit.* vol. ii. p. 474. [2] *Ibid.* vol. ii. p. 493.

[3] He developed his view of the Eucharist specially in his 'Letter to S. Harford, Esq., prefatory to the Treatise on the Eucharist, on the Use and Import of the Eucharistic Symbols' and in 'Postscript to the Treatise on the Eucharist,' both in vol. ii. of *Remains*.

own hands, which He saw fit to appoint.'[1] And the eloquent from which he sometimes gives to this thought of Christ's Presence in the Sacrament, as a direct counterpart of His human earthly life, shows plainly that here we have to do with no mere scholastic play of thought, but the expression of a living piety.[2]

Such is the background against which we have to regard the Eucharistic teaching of the Oxford school. We can distinguish here a dualism, to some extent answering to what we noticed in the matter of the High Church view of Baptism; on the one hand the doctrine of the Real Presence as the seal of faithful High Churchmanship, on the other a deepening of the mystical content of the Eucharist as a means of the inflowing of the Divine grace into man, and the taking up of the individual into the Divine. Perhaps one might maintain that in this, otherwise than in the matter of Baptism, it is the purely religious side which, in combination with the full development of the mystical religious type, and subject to manifold influence from antiquity, first asserts itself, and that the ecclesiastically objective way of looking at things only later appropriates the deepening of Eucharistic piety already won—with the most fatal consequences. Certainly it is probable that Liddon is right when he informs us that Pusey received the doctrine of 'the Real Presence' from his mother as a precious heirloom[3]; a sacramental feeling breathes through 'The Christian Year,' a feeling fed both by High Church tradition and the Nature symbolism of Wordsworth; there is a reflection in Palmer of the Eucharistic doctrine of earlier High Anglicanism.[4] But during the earlier phases of the Oxford Movement there was no fresh life in all this. In the Tract series reprints from Beveridge and Cosin (Tracts 25–28)

[1] *Remains*, vol. ii. p. 206.

[2] 'Let us recognise the same spirit of meek majesty which veiled its transcendent brightness in the mystery of the Incarnation, as still continuing the like gracious condescension in the mystery of the Eucharist; and let us joyfully and reverently approach to do homage to our King who, in this His peculiar institution, comes to diffuse benediction in His mystical Zion, with the same apparent lowliness as when, in conformity with the Divine prediction, He entered His literal Jerusalem, "sitting upon an ass and upon a colt, the foal of an ass" ' (*Remains*, vol. ii. p. 221).

[3] Liddon, *Life of Pusey*, vol. i. p. 7.

[4] Cp. Stone, *op. cit.* vol. ii. p. 531.

first bring up questions affecting the Eucharist; later, in 1837, there is a catena of older Anglican theologians.[1] When, in 1838, Newman treats the subject in two sermons, one feels that the theme did not specially inspire him. One, 'The Gospel Feast,'[2] puts together Biblical passages, which can be explained as types of the Eucharist, and adds to them a very tame conclusion. In another, 'The Eucharistic Presence,' there is a very dry presentation of the correct doctrine of a Presence of Christ, which is real, without being corporal, thus rejecting Transubstantiation: while a typically Tractarian warning is added, not to neglect this means of grace; it may contain more than we now see in it.[3]

It is Pusey's piety which, dominated as it is by the thought of a divine influx and the divine indwelling, becomes the field in which Sacramentalism attached to the Eucharist springs up and flourishes. To produce this the usually strong influence of antiquity in this connection was hardly necessary.

That it was Pusey's sermon, 'The Holy Eucharist a Comfort to the Penitent,'[4] which roused the University authorities more violently than anything which had previously occurred during the Oxford Movement, is specially illuminating, all the more as the six doctors could scarcely have quoted valid grounds for their condemnation in the confessionary documents of their Church. What happened was the reaction of Protestant Anglicanism against what was instinctively felt to be the child of a different spirit. In Pusey, Sacramental mysticism had been directly nourished by contact with the early Church. This was not beyond the ken of the English Reformers: Pusey can cite from the Anglican Homilies patristic phrases quoted in them which support his own view ('a deifical communion,' 'the Food of immortality'); but in the average Anglican theology of the early nineteenth

[1] Tract 81, *Testimony of Writers in the Later English Church to the Doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice.*

[2] *Parochial and Plain Sermons*, vol. vii. No. 12.

[3] 'Let us fear, lest a real though invisible work of power being vouchsafed to us, greater far than that of the loaves . . . we lose the benefit of it by disbelieving it' (*ibid.* vol. vi. No. 11, p. 145).

[4] *A Sermon preached before the University in the Cathedral Church of Christ, in Oxford, on the Fourth Sunday after Easter* (Oxford, 1841).

century the Protestant type of religion had been further developed in an anti-mystical direction, after having passed through the purgatory of rationalism. It stamped itself by condemning Pusey.

In Pusey's condemned Sermon, as in others which may appropriately be classed with it,[1] we find an expression of the patristic, particularly of the Greek Fathers' view of religion, which can seldom in modern times have been more intensive or more genuine. The gift of the Eucharist is not, as with Baptism, in the first instance, forgiveness of sins, but the maintaining of a life already given. 'Baptism engrafts in the true Vine; the Holy Eucharist derives the richness and fulness of His life into the branches thus engraffed.'[2] But the chief point is, that it is a real gift which is conveyed, a genuine living substance which is infused. The whole doctrine of the Eucharist is summarized with an unmerciful energy, which seems to take a delight in paradox for its own sake. 'He is the Living Bread, because He came down from Heaven, and as being One God with the Father, hath life in Himself, even as the Father hath life in Himself; the life then which He is, He imparted to that Flesh which He took into Himself, yea, which He took so wholly, that Holy Scripture says He became it. "The Word became Flesh," and since it is thus a part of Himself, "Whoso eateth My Flesh, and drinketh My Blood" (He Himself says the amazing words), "eateth ME," and so receiveth into Himself, in an ineffable manner, his Lord Himself, "dwelleth" (our Lord says) "in Me and I in him," and having Christ within him, not only shall he have, but he hath already eternal life, because he hath Him, Who is the Only True God and Eternal Life; and so Christ "will raise him up at the last Day," because he hath His life in him. Receiving Him into this very body, they who are His, receive life, which shall pass over to our very decaying flesh; they have within them Him who is Life and Immortality and Incorruption, to cast out or absorb into itself our natural mortality and death and corruption,

[1] See, *e.g.*, 'The Christian's Life in Christ' and 'Heaven the Christian's Home' in *Sermons from Advent to Whitsuntide*, and among the *Leeds Sermons* especially 'Loving Penitence' and 'Glory of the Body.'

[2] *The Holy Eucharist a Comfort to the Penitent*, pp. 3 f.

and "shall live for ever," because made one with Him who Alone "liveth for evermore." '[1] There would be no need for the quotations from Cyril, Chrysostom, Irenaeus and Gregory of Nazianzum, which abound, to show where this apparently purely physical process of thought comes from.

To the Body of the Incarnate Son is attached a Divinity, which is almost physically expressed,[2] and the Chalcedonian doctrine of the two natures thus becomes a satisfactory expression of the meeting between the Divine and the human. Consequently, this our own fleshly nature became so elevated that: 'How should it not be, that an exceeding mystery should belong to this poor, corruptible, suffering body, when He Who is God vouchsafed for ever to take it, in its real substance, although holy and undefiled, into God; to make our flesh the bond of union between the Creator and the Creature, taking it into Himself, and Himself now dwelling in our corruptible bodies?'[3]

This substantial union between the divine and human in the Incarnate Lord is the pattern of our union with God, and this is realised by our participation in the Lord's Body and Blood. It is the endeavour of the Christian to 'be caught up within the influence of the mystery of that ineffable love whereby the Father would draw us to that oneness with Him, which is the perfection of eternal bliss, where will, thought, affections shall be one, because we shall be, by communication of His Divine Nature, one. Yet such is undoubted Catholic teaching, and the most literal import of Holy Scripture, and the mystery of the Sacrament, that the Eternal Word, Who is God, has taken to Him our flesh and joined it indissolubly with Himself, and so where His Flesh is, there He is, and we receiving It receive Him, and receiving Him

[1] *The Holy Eucharist a Comfort to the Penitent*, p. 7.

[2] In a sermon 'Loving Penitence' it is said of the sinful woman who washed Jesus' feet: 'Her sin-defiled lips stained not the Holy, but the cleansing touch of that Flesh which He gave for the lips of the world hallows them. He from the hem of Whose garment Virtue had gone forth to heal, He Who was Himself that living, purifying Form of Fire, His Sacred manhood filled with His Godhead which is a consuming fire, touched her lips, and her iniquity is taken away and her sin purged' (*Leeds Sermons*, p. 18); cp. the mystical view of Christ's glorified Body in 'The Transfiguration of our Lord, the Earnest of the Christian's Glory,' in *Plain Sermons*, vol. iii. p. 226.

[3] *Leeds Sermons*, p. 292.

are joined on to Him through His Flesh to the Father, and He dwelling in us, dwell in Him, and with Him in God.'[1] Thus the physical ideas are fired with a passionate longing for God. Pusey puts in a certain antithesis to each other the two chief gifts of the Sacrament, the one union with God, 'the infusion into us of His Spirit, and life and immortality, making us one with His glorified Humanity,' and the other, forgiveness of sins: and it is characteristic that it is the former which has the deepest content to Him.[2] By taking upon Him our Flesh He has sanctified it as His dwelling. It is therefore possible for Him to dwell in us. Great as was His favour to the prophets and Patriarchs of the Old Testament, 'greater are the wonders of the Gospel than those of the Old Testament. . . .' 'Closer is the nearness of Almighty God to those who will receive Him than when He walked with Adam in Paradise, or seemed to sit with Abraham, or to speak to Moses, Face to face, or when the Angel in Whom His Presence was, wrestled with Jacob . . . yea, nearer yet, than when in the Flesh, His disciples did eat and drink with Him, and went in and out with Him, or Mary sat at His Feet, or His Mother carried Him in her arms, or St. John lay in His Bosom, or St. Thomas thrust his hand into His Side. . . . Such nearness had Judas also who kissed Him. . . . The Christian's nearness He hath told: "We will come unto him and make Our Abode with him," in Holiness, Purity, Peace, Bliss, cleansing Love."[3]

So this piety returns again and again to the thought of indwelling—Christ in us, he says, is the special mystery of the Gospel. This is the very mystery and blessedness of the sacraments, 'that by the one, Christ knit us into Himself; by the other, He descendeth to us that He may become "one with us, and we with Him."'[4] Thus the Eucharist becomes the very Gate of Heaven: 'Where is the soul of the devout communicant, in Heaven or on Earth? Surely not on earth,

[1] *The Holy Eucharist a Comfort to the Penitent*, p. 14.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 25; *Sermons from Advent to Whitsuntide*, p. 231. The forgiveness of sins has generally to the Oxford school little of the religious richness which in the prophetic type of religion made it one of the chief formulae for God's communication of Himself. Now and then Pusey, significantly enough following Tauler, teaches a deeper view of it.

[3] *Sermons from Advent to Whitsuntide*, p. 238.

[4] *Ibid.* ('Heaven the Christian's Home') p. 335.

which it is taught to forget, through the Holy Sweetness which streams forth upon it, and the joy which bedews it, that it is washed through its Saviour's Blood.'[1] Thus the communicant is led into the sphere where earth and all created things disappear from view, where the ears are 'deafened to all sound except the harmony of the Love of God.' No doubt there are also other ways of entering into communion with God. 'Yet as the life of the Archangel is higher than the life of the worm, although both are upheld in life by Him, so has He, in the stores of His Sacramental Grace, a Fulness of Life and Love, an ineffable Presence, "torrents of Pleasure," a soul-subduing awful Nearness, and transporting Union, as different from that which He bestows at earlier stages, as the Archangel's life from that of us poor defiled worms of earth.'[2]

It will scarcely be necessary futher to illustrate the view of the Eucharist which we find in this earlier preaching of Pusey. Dogmatically he may not have departed from the traditional Anglican ground; the new notes heard come not from Rome but from primitive Catholicism. The increased reverence for the elements themselves, which later Neo-Anglicanism evermore clothed in forms borrowed from the Roman Church, was foreign to Tractarian Sacramentalism. Though it revived thoughts which were later applied to justify the re-introduction of the Mass without general Communion, as a sacrifice and a service of the highest value, it still only knew the Eucharist as a communion, and it was thus it got its unique importance as the means of the influx of Divine Grace, of participation in the union of human and Divine which was first effectually brought to pass in the Incarnation.

It remains briefly to show how this sacramentalism, which we saw form the natural conclusion to the evolution of Tractarian religion, conceals the seeds of various developments. They can be expressed in the form of three corollaries:

[1] *Sermons from Advent to Whitsuntide*, p. 336.

[2] *Ibid.* ('Increased Communions) p. 322; cp. Newman's sermon, 'Shrinking from Christ's Coming' (*Parochial and Plain Sermons*, vol. iv. No. 4): 'it is awful to meet God in prayer, but much more so, in the Sacrament of Holy Communion; for this is in very form an anticipation of His Coming' (p. 56).

I. The Sacramental view was bound to be reflected in a higher importance attached to divine service and church buildings on the whole. Probably this had already been prepared for and partly directly produced by the Romantic temper, which was one of the chief factors in the Oxford Movement, though not the most essential. But during the actual Movement, the interest in the outward forms of Divine service was of secondary importance, though the matter has often been otherwise represented. It is only the sacramental religion which becomes the motive of a new reverence for the forms of Divine Service and its holy places, a motive which would soon show itself to have an intensity and a vehemence such as no aestheticism alone could have evoked. It seems as if one could detect in the sermons how a more indefinite need of devotion, a requirement of reverence for that which is hallowed by tradition, gradually takes more definite shape, and finally is centred round the Sacrament.[1]

When, in 1834, Newman preaches on 'The Good Part of Mary,' he laments that the age does not require 'the entire system of tranquil devotion, holy meditation, freedom from worldly cares, which our Saviour praises in the case of Mary.'[2] Two years later he speaks of 'Reverence in Worship' as something that distinguishes the members of the Church, while 'those who have separated from the Church of Christ' regard themselves as having been brought so near to God 'that they have no need to fear at all, or to put any restraint upon their words or thoughts when addressing Him. . . . They have learnt to be familiar and free with sacred things, as it were, on principle.'[3] He maintains that 'we must not aim at forms for their own sake but we must keep in mind where we are, and then forms will come into our service naturally. We must in all respects act as if we saw

[1] It is significant of the above-mentioned shifting of the emphasis from Baptism to the Sacrament of the Altar that Newman in 1833 sees in Baptism above all the vehicle of the Divine Presence in man. This is in a sermon, 'The Gift of the Spirit' (*Parochial and Plain Sermons*, vol. iii. No. 18), where a highly mystical view of the Church is expressed; the thought of the presence of the Spirit in the Church 'cannot fail to produce in us deeper and more reverent feelings towards the Church of Christ, as His especial dwelling-place. It is evident that we are in a much more extraordinary state than we are at all aware of' (p. 270).

[2] *Ibid.* vol. iii. No. 22, p. 332.

[3] *Ibid.* vol. viii. No. 1, p. 6.

God.'[1] These thoughts recur, but against a background of apocalyptic temper, in an Advent sermon of the same year ('Worship a Preparation for Christ's Coming').[2] The ordinances of the Church are to keep us watching and waiting. They are there to communicate to us experiences of that which lies on the other side of the thick veil which divides Heaven and Earth. 'At times we seem to catch a glimpse of that Form which we shall hereafter see face to face. We approach, and in spite of the darkness, our hands, or our head, or our brow, or our lips become, as it were, sensible of the contact of something more than earthly. We know not where we are, but we have been bathing in water, and a voice tells us that it is blood. Or we have a mark signed upon our foreheads, and it spake of Calvary. Or we recollect a hand laid upon our heads, and surely it had the print of nails in it, and resembled His Who with a touch gave sight to the blind, and raised the dead. Or we have been eating and drinking; and it was not a dream surely, that One fed us from His wounded Side, and renewed our nature by the heavenly Meat He gave.'[3] The importance of church buildings is to symbolise the true spiritual Church, and 'most unhappy they who, while they have eyes to admire, admire them only for their beauty's sake, and the skill they exhibit; who regard them as works of art, not fruits of grace.'[4] Therefore it is only as an act of confession that it has its

[1] *Op. cit.* p. 8. The thought is developed in a sermon 'Reverence a Belief in God's Presence.' Feelings of fear and awe 'are the class of feelings we should have if we realise His Presence' (*ibid.* vol. v. No. 2, p. 21). The feeling of God's Presence 'is one of both joy and pain, or rather one far above either; a feeling of awe, wonder and praise, which cannot be more suitably expressed than by the Scripture word "fear"' (p. 26).

[2] The eschatological background of the religious temper of the Oxford Movement must not be overlooked. Newman expects a sudden Day of Judgment—as the world was suddenly created (any thought of evolution in nature is foreign to him). 'He began the world we see, not from its first seeds and elements, but He created at once the herb and the fruit-tree perfect . . . not a gradual formation, but a complete work' (*ibid.* vol. vi. p. 269). The time between Christ's first and second coming has only a relative reality; before the Incarnation the stream of time flowed straight to the abyss, but then it altered its course and now flows parallel to it. 'Christ, then, is ever at our doors . . . as we listen for a clock to strike, and at length it surprises us; or a crumbling arch hangs, we know not how, and it is not safe to pass under; so creeps on this feeble world, and one day, before we know where we are, it will end' (*ibid.* ('Waiting for Christ') vol. vi. No. 17, p. 241).

[3] *Ibid.* vol. v. No. 1, p. 10.

[4] *Ibid.* ('The Gospel Palaces') vol. vi. No. 19, p. 279.

value to decorate the sanctuary. It is natural and suitable for those who are cultivating the inner life to contribute to the adornment of worship 'to make the beauty of holiness visible.'[1] But 'let us use visible things not to hide, but to remind us of things visible.'[2] And in 1842 communion, the literal bodily action of passing along the aisle, kneeling at the Altar, and 'receiving of the gift of eternal life in the form of Bread and Wine,' is represented as the Christian's primary duty, a duty which many evade because they believe that 'the blessed Sacrament binds them to live very much more strictly and thoughtfully than they do at present.' Men are afraid of binding themselves to bear Christ's yoke. 'But while the times wax old, and the colours of earth fade, and the voice of song is brought low, and all kindreds of the earth can but wail and lament, the Sons of God lift up their heads, for their salvation draweth nigh. Nature fails, the sun shines not, and the moon is dim, the stars fall from Heaven, and the foundations of the round world shake; but the Altar's light burns ever brighter; there are sights there which the many cannot see, and all above the tumults of earth the command is heard to show forth the Lord's Death, and the promise that the Lord is coming.'[3]

During the actual Oxford Movement and in its proper sphere, hardly any ritual innovations took place. It was outside the University that Ritualism was born. Accounts spread about of remarkable alterations in the traditional attire of the clergy are ridiculed by Newman in his letters. It is not likely that the surplice replaced the black gown in St. Mary's pulpit before this change was universally introduced in London by order of the Bishop of the Diocese.[4] All their

[1] *Op. cit.* ('Offerings for the Sanctuary') vol. vi. No. 21, p. 314.

[2] P. 312; cp. *ibid.* ('The Visible Temple') vol. vi. No. 20, p. 294: '... may He in His Mercy grant that our outward show does not outstrip our inward progress; that whatever gift, rare or beautiful, we introduce here, may be but a figure of inward beauty, and unseen sanctity, ornamenting our hearts. Hearts are the true shrines wherein Christ must dwell.'

[3] *Ibid.* ('Attendance on Holy Communion') vol. vii. No. 11, p. 158.

[4] An interesting testimony as to the resistance with which this and similar novelties were received in Oxford is found in a description by the then Swedish Pastor in London, G. W. Carlsson, in one of his articles on Puseyism in *Svenska Biet* for 1854 (No. 98; for the authorship see G. W. Carlsson, *Den Svenska kyrkan i London*, Stockholm, 1852, p. 159).

lives Pusey and Keble were conservative in their ritual practice. Only in one respect a change took place, which was almost inevitable with the predominance of sacramental piety: the number of celebrations was increased. While Newman introduced them at St. Mary-the-Virgin every week, and at an early hour,[1] Pusey, in his famous sermon of 1843, laments that Christ Church Cathedral lacks the privilege of a weekly Eucharist, which now many country churches enjoyed, and scarcely celebrates the Sacrament of the Altar more than once a month.[2] It had, however, once been the intention of the English Reformation to reintroduce daily Communion in Cathedrals.[3] Now this seems wonderful and strange: 'It implies a life so different from this our commonplace ordinary tenor . . . an union with God so close, that we cannot mostly, I suppose, imagine to ourselves, how we could daily thus be in Heaven and in our daily business here below, how sanctify our daily duties, thoughts, refreshment, so that they should be tinged with the hues reflected by our daily Heaven, not that heavenly Gift be dimmed with our earthliness; how our souls should through the day shine with the glory of that ineffable Presence to which we had approached, not we approach to It with earth-dimmed souls.'[4]

More frequent Communions would increase, not diminish devotion. But more frequent Communions must involve also an alteration of life, more rest with God and abstention from society, 'deeper consciousness of His Presence, greater love of His Passion, which we celebrate, and a bearing about of it in severe self-control and self-discipline, and in self-denying love. But in spite of the awfulness of God's Presence into which we thus shall venture to enter, we need have no fear, save that we should lose our fear. For where there is fear,

[1] Newman, 'A Letter addressed to the Bishop of Oxford' (*Via Media*, vol. ii. p. 419). 'We shall remember how we got up early in the morning, and how all things, light or darkness, sun or air, cold or freshness, breathed of Him—of Him, the Lord of Glory, who stood over us, and came down upon us, and gave Himself to us' (*Parochial and Plain Sermons* ('Present Blessings'), vol. v. No. 19, p. 283). Daily morning prayer began at St. Mary's in 1834 (Pattison, *Memoirs*, p. 201).

[2] *The Holy Eucharist a Comfort to the Penitent*, p. 29.

[3] According to the *First Prayer-Book of Edward VI*; cp. Tract No. 81, p 18.

[4] *The Holy Eucharist a Comfort to the Penitent*, p. 29.

there is watchfulness and humble approach and earnest caution; and where these are, there is God's Favour, Who despiseth not a broken and a contrite heart. And this fear and reverent awe will, if we be watchful, increase with increasing devotion and more frequent Communions.'[1] Thus is the direction given for a development which would more than anything else determine the continued history of Neo-Anglicanism. It would in its time, in definitely High Church circles, lead to an increase in the frequency of Communion which certainly went beyond what Pusey can have expected. But it deserves to be emphasised, that this increased frequency of Communion, though promoted by outside impulses from modern and especially French Romanism, yet, in its essence, is to be regarded as an independent development: it conflicts with the mediaeval practice, but like the earlier English Reformation links on with the early Church. But strictly it does not rise from a desire to imitate primitive practice, but is the natural consequence of the revived doctrine of the early Church about the Incarnation and the nature of Sacramental Grace.

II. But the Church not merely gets indirectly its share of the reverence with which its sacramental acts are surrounded, but receives a sacramental nature itself. The society itself becomes, as the mystical Body of Christ, the vehicle for the influx of grace. Certainly Newman retains from earlier phases of his development a certain duality in the view of the Church, which makes it difficult for him to make real the identification of the Church as God's invisible Temple—'composed of souls; a Temple with God for its Light and Christ for the High Priest, with wings of Angels for its arches, with Saints and Teachers for its pillars, and with worshippers for its pavement,' this invisible temple, which is found wherever Christians meet, independent of all external splendour—with the visible Church, which Christ in His mercy erected among us, as 'His Own Court, and His Own Polity, that men might have something to fix their eyes upon of a more Divine and holy character than the world can supply.' Here the visible

[1] Pusey in a sermon 'Increased Communions' which was delivered to remove misunderstandings, when weekly Communion had just been introduced (*Sermons from Advent to Whitsuntide*, p. 316).

Church seems scarcely to be anything but the symbol in time of the visible Temple which is built up of the men whom He redeemed.[1] To Pusey again, who arrives at the question of the Church's Sacramental nature as Christ's mystical Body, less from speculation on the Church's nature than from his own living sacramental religion, this contrast seems scarcely to have been consciously felt. 'It is not by a figure only, that our Blessed Lord is called our Head, and we his Members.[2] . . . Christians themselves together with their Head, Which hath ascended into Heaven, are one Christ. He is not One and we many, but we too, being many, are One thing (*Unum*) in Him being One. There is then One Man Christ, Head and Body. What is His Body? His Church, the Apostle saith, "for we are Members of His Body."'[3] No doubt the empirical and institutional Church may quite retire into the background when this thought becomes more explicit: 'His Church is His Body, the token and channel of His Presence, possessing as a whole (as we daily repeat of Her) His Attributes of "Holiness," because She is (Scripture saith) His Body, indwelt by His Divinity; the Body whereof He is the Head, and, as such, living by His Life, moved by His Will, informed by His Spirit, imperishable, because as the Head forsaketh not the members, so neither He the Body He hath taken. She is one Body, composed of the elder and more perfect Saints, who are now perfected, and of us, as many of us as are yet in the Vine, and partake of His Holiness, and are living branches.'[4]

It is beyond our present task to follow out the manner in which this line is continued by the later Neo-Anglicanism with its developed doctrine of the Church as the continuation of the Incarnation: here too purely religious factors tend to produce a progressive idea of the Church. Similarly it is a question, which cannot be fully discussed here, in what measure impulses to this development from certain—Roman Catholic—quarters have co-operated. There is certainly scarcely any doubt that

[1] See Newman's sermon, 'The Visible Temple,' in *Parochial and Plain Sermons*, vol. vi. No. 20. In certain of the *Sermons on Subjects of the Day* this dualism is obscured by the shadow which the full Roman doctrine here throws forward.

[2] Cp. Newman, *Parochial and Plain Sermons*, vol. iii. No. 18, p. 260.

[3] Pusey, *Sermons from Advent to Whitsuntide*, p. 332.

[4] *Ibid.* pp. 54 f.

there is the closest kinship between this sacramental idea of Pusey's, united with the Gospel of the Incarnation, and the view which, about the same time as the Oxford Movement, was expounded by the Liberal Catholic theologian, J. A. Möhler, especially in his ' Symbolik oder Darstellung der dogmatischen Gegensätze der Katholiken und Protestanten ' (the first edition appeared in 1832).[1] But it seems doubtful whether this work exercised any direct influence on the Oxford Movement proper.[2] On the other hand the palpable convergence of the views is probably to be explained as the independent results of the same fundamental elements.

III. Our third corollary aims at pointing out one of the fundamental causes of what it is tempting to call the tragedy of later Neo-Anglicanism. This can here be sketched only very categorically and briefly: we should have to enter into an analysis of the whole of this development to give the proofs of a statement which now perhaps may seem to be somewhat rashly made. The Sacramental idea of the Church, in itself capable of a wide and fruitful development, is locked fast by its combination with the static view. As far as the Sacramental idea became the centre of gravity, guarantees for the validity of sacraments were bound to get an ever-increasing importance. And when the means of testing the validity were provided by the static theory, above all by the doctrine of Apostolical Succession, this theory tended to become a suffocating snare, drawn ever tighter in proportion to the vigour and intensity of religious life. No doubt during the progress of the Movement disobedience to the living episcopate was a distinguishing feature, as often as its commands seemed to conflict with the requirements of sacramental religion—and this is one of the

[1] This applies perhaps still more to Möhler's earlier work, *Die Einheit der Kirche oder das Prinzip des Katholicismus* (1825), in which his Liberal Catholicism is more strongly emphasised. When in his *Symbolik* he says that the Church, as Christ's ' bleibende Erscheinung,' is divine and human at once, is an unity of both (6th ed., p. 336), this might certainly have been accepted by Pusey as his own view.

[2] In Newman's correspondence Möhler's work on Athanasius is once mentioned in a letter of November 5, 1834, but nothing indicates that he traced in him an allied spirit. In the library which Pusey left is included Möhler's *Symbolik*, but it is not known when he made acquaintance with the work. For Möhler's influence on the development of Neo-Anglicanism cp. H. Böhmer, ' Die Kirche Englands und der Protestantismus,' in *Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift* (1916).

best proofs of what was the deepest driving-force. But although this to some extent may appear as a revolt against staticism, it resulted only in an appeal from the living episcopate to the tribunal of the 'Catholic' Church. This, again, opened two possibilities: either this tribunal was found only in the unmovable past of ecclesiastical precedents—or in the Church of Rome. It is difficult to say which of these two alternatives is most to be deprecated.

Nothing perhaps is more illuminating in this respect than the relation of the Oxford Movement to the idea of Church re-union. This idea proceeds already from the premises given in the static view of the Church, but only belief in the Sacramental Church as Christ's mystical body has given to it a deeply religious significance. Thus the two main lines of the Oxford Movement lead up to this idea, and perhaps the desire for re-union has nowhere been more of a real passion than with the leaders of the Movement and their spiritual kindred. Thus Neo-Anglicanism has, to an extent that can hardly be overestimated, given life and strength to the work for Christian unity. But, on the other hand, does it not itself remain one of the chief obstacles to the realisation of unity within non-Roman Christianity? Have not even the modest advances which the episcopate has made, or might have found it possible to make, as far as it was itself concerned, been rendered futile, or impossible, either by the learned appeal to precedents, or by the more violent reaction of progressive Sacramentalism, that seems to find it impossible to recognise the reality of Christianity in other devotional forms than its own?

The past only falls within the competence of the historian. But it is sometimes difficult for him to refrain from interpreting the present in the light which he believes he has got from the study of what has been. Are the rich and noble forces contained in Neo-Anglicanism to remain shut up in the prison-house of static Catholicity, or are they to be set free to grasp the deep and real Catholicity, which is not limited by any conciliar ordinances, but includes in the mystical body of Christ all genuine Christian life which is born and nurtured by contact with the living spirit of the Master?

# APPENDICES

## APPENDIX I

### Note on the Question of the Dependence of the Oxford Movement on Knox and Jebb

In an article in *Contemporary Review*, 1887, 'Alexander Knox and the Oxford Movement,' Professor G. T. Stokes emphatically expressed the view that Knox is the real origin of the Tractarian Movement, especially in having passed on to it the legacy of Wesley. This, Stokes thinks, is where the sacramental views of the Oxford Movement came from, and it is also Wesley's requirement of frequent Communion which reappears in Neo-Anglicanism. So in the matter of the doctrine of Justification, Knox is the connecting link between Wesley and Newman. He maintains the same origin in the matter of obligatory fasts, prayers for the dead, and admiration for the great mystics. On the whole Knox's influence was carried on by Jebb who, though he was a learned theologian with humanistic culture, yet lacked originality, and the author gives this sharply formulated summing up of his view: 'Wesley begat Knox, and Knox begat Jebb, and Jebb begat Rose, and Pusey and Newman.'

This challenging theory has naturally not been well received by the historians of the Tractarian Movement. It was answered the same year by Church (*Guardian*, September 7, 1887), who definitely maintains independence of Knox and Wesley on the part of the Oxford men: 'The Oxford men found their doctrines where Wesley in his younger days found them and where Knox found them afterwards, but quite certainly they did not find them through Knox or Wesley.' He declares that Stokes builds his assertions on an insufficient material, and that no personal relations existed between the Oxford men and Knox. Probably Knox on some points anticipated the programme of the Movement and prepared the way for it, but Church does not think it would have been in any way different if Knox had never written a line.

All Church's direct assertions about the Oxford Movement may certainly claim to be received with the fullest reliance. That Stokes'

actual material does not justify the far-reaching conclusions he draws from it, may be regarded as proved. In his 'History of the Oxford Movement' also Church recognised the kindred matter in Jebb's writings, and in these he hears 'echoes of the meditations of a remarkable Irishman, Mr. Alexander Knox.' But his view is that it was only after the Oxford Movement had taken shape that their full importance was recognised. But the question is scarcely settled by this, and in any case it deserves a fuller discussion than it has received. At present the historians of the movement, if they notice Knox at all, with a certain irritation reject a thought which they appear to think might rob the recognised fathers of Neo-Anglicanism of a good deal of their originality.[1] Liddon states categorically that 'Tractarians . . . certainly were not indebted to him (Knox) for anything they knew of Catholic antiquity and Catholic truth,' and quotes Pusey as his verbal authority.[2]

It must be admitted that the actual material bearing on the relations of Knox and the Oxford men is very scanty. For it is scarcely advisable to attach too great importance to an utterance of Cardinal Newman's brother, F. W. Newman, whose reminiscences show such a distressing witness of the author's inability to understand the development of a brother whose line was so distasteful to him. He says: 'Puseyism did not begin with my brother, but with Alexander Knox, a pious admirer of Wesley, who condescended to give me several private talks in Ireland.'[3] Knox himself seems only to have become well known by his 'Remains.' The first time he is mentioned in Newman's correspondence is in a letter of Newman, dated February 9, 1835, in which he compares Knox to Coleridge. In a letter written in September of the same year, B. Harrison remarks that Knox's 'Remains' is one of the books Rose wishes to have reviewed in the *British Magazine*, and adds: 'I know that Pusey reads Knox very attentively.' To contemporaries it was not yet clear that Jebb was only Knox's mouthpiece, and Jebb was not unknown to the Oxford men. On October 27, 1833, W. Palmer writes to Newman: 'I wish you and Froude and Keble could have heard the Bishop of Limerick and Mr. Forster yesterday, talking of Church matters: it would have done your heart good.' That at least the branch of the Movement represented by Palmer received strong influence from Jebb seems probable. On November 22, 1836, H. W. Wilberforce, in a letter to Newman, gives his impressions of Jebb,

[1] Thus, *e.g.*, Ollard in his *Oxford Movement*.

[2] *Life of Pusey*, vol. i. p. 260. For Keble's view of Knox see Coleridge, *Memoir of Keble*, vol. i. pp. 250 f.

[3] *Contributions chiefly to the Early History of the late Cardinal Newman* (2nd ed., London, 1891), p. 42.

and says that he, without belonging to the Oxford school, has come to entirely the same conclusions through his own study of Christian antiquity. Newman noted on this that, so far as he knows, he has never personally met Jebb. Personal influence on the actual Oxford leaders at the beginning of the movement, with the possible exception of W. Palmer, can scarcely have been noticeable. Later when ' Remains ' came out, they must have been helpful to some extent, but scarcely have evoked general attention ; the controversy already began to centre round the Tracts, and Knox had no voice to make himself heard in the din of battle. On one point Newman admitted that he had taken notice of Knox in his ' Lectures on Justification,' 1838, when he quotes him in the preface, but only to declare his independence. But that he was not blind to Knox's importance as a pioneer is shown by an essay of 1839 on ' The Prospects of the Anglican Church.' [1] After having spoken of Walter Scott and Coleridge he gives Knox an unreserved recognition.[2]

But though the direct influence exercised by Knox and Jebb on the Oxford Leaders cannot have been essential, the question of their importance in the history of Neo-Anglicanism is not thereby exhausted. The Anglican Renaissance is not, as was previously pointed out, identical with the Oxford Movement. That the Tracts found the ground so well prepared we must be right in ascribing in no small degree to the influence of the Irish brothers.[3] The clear and at the same time moderate formulation of the Anglican conception of the Church which we find in Jebb's ' Appendix ' will assure them a place of honour in the history of Neo-Anglicanism as its real though often forgotten pioneers. And it may give rise to melancholy reflections, that it was only in the narrowed and one-sided edition of Tractarianism that these thoughts could come forth as a conquering and renewing force in the old Ecclesia Anglicana.

[1] In the *British Magazine*, afterwards reprinted in *Essays Critical and Historical*.

[2] ' The reaction within the Church or whatever name we choose to apply, was anticipated long before, that is long before it showed itself in any definite form which could strike the eye of the public. Twenty-three years ago an acute observer, withdrawn from the world and observing its movements at a distance, writes as follows :—' Then follows a quotation from Knox's *Remains*, vol. i. No. 50, and a comment on it. Newman adds that Knox's writings are no small witness of the intellectual and moral movement which preceded the Oxford Movement, and that Knox plainly conceived his attitude to the great work of restoration he prepared (*Essays*, vol. i. pp. 269–271).

[3] When, by study of Hooker and Butler, Gladstone was led from his youthful Evangelicalism nearer to the High Anglican position, he says of himself : ' I found food for the new ideas and tendencies in various quarters, not least in the religious writings of Alexander Knox, all of which I perused ' (J. Morley, *Life of Gladstone* (London, 1908), vol. i. p. 119).

## APPENDIX II

### The Oxford Movement as judged by Contemporaries and Posterity. A Bibliographic Study

It is clear that this survey of literature, which does not aim at bibliographic completeness,[1] must leave out the literary monuments which have been quoted in the historical sketch of the Movement that produced them, as well as most of the biographic material referred to in Chapter VIII. A few of the writings previously discussed must, however, be mentioned again. First amongst these is W. Palmer's ' Narrative of Events connected with the Publication of the Tracts for the Times ' [2] (Oxford, 1843), which must here be considered as the earliest of personal recollections. This is interesting because it shows the Movement on the side of what might be called its right wing. W. Palmer had been educated at Trinity College, Dublin, and when he became a member of Worcester College, Oxford, brought to the University a fund of abstruse learning, particularly in scholastic theology and liturgics. His ' Origines Liturgicae ' were epoch-making in the study of the subject in England. Through his own studies he had arrived at a conception of the Church closely akin to Rose's, and in course of time put it forth in a work, the systematic thoroughness of which is unfortunately more prominent than its readableness.[3] He was not much touched by the religious enthusiasm which with the leaders proper

[1] The best bibliography I know of the Oxford Movement is that drawn up by S. L. Ollard for the twelfth volume of *The Cambridge History of English Literature*, which contains an interesting sketch of the literary history of the Oxford Movement by the Dean of Winchester (Dr. W. H. Hutton).

[2] Reprinted with an introduction and a supplement (London, 1883).

[3] W. Palmer, *A Treatise on the Church of Christ* (London, 1838 ; 3rd ed., 1842). He had previously, in 1832, published a pamphlet, *Remarks on Dr. Arnold's Principles of Church Reform.* He entered later into active controversy with Wiseman. He also wrote against Newman's *Development of Christian Doctrine.* After his father's death he was Sir William Palmer (1803–85), and is to be distinguished from his namesake (1811–79), Fellow of Magdalen, who was an enthusiastic admirer of the Eastern Church, but went over to Rome in 1855.

made the Movement something greater and deeper than a mere ecclesiastical reaction. But his lack of inspiration had increased his reliability as an observer. The book, as has been previously stated, was written to maintain the special character of original Tractarianism against the later Romanising wing, especially W. G. Ward.[1]

In this context it is unnecessary to say much of Newman's 'Apologia.' It has already occupied us as a source for his life, and it is only when one maintains its markedly subjective character, and also the distance in time which separates the description from the actual events, that it can with advantage be used as a source of information about the Oxford Movement. A few years after going over to Rome, in the narrative 'Loss and Gain' (1848), Newman satirically sketched the spiritual atmosphere of the Oxford Movement, in the process sparing as little the party whose leader he himself so recently had been, with its antiquarian and 'Catholic' amateurishness, as the Evangelical school with its pious tea-parties. For the delineation of the young hero, Charles Reding, who, of course, reaches port in the only true Church, he probably used a good deal of autobiographic material.[2]

It is of interest to contrast the calmer and more placable tone of 'Apologia' with the scornful satire of 'Loss and Gain.' All the bitterness against the Church of his upbringing and early manhood, which dominated the convert during his first period as a Catholic, comes out also in 'Twelve Lectures addressed to the Anglican Party' of 1833,[3] which on the theme of the irreconcilability of Anglo-Catholic principles with the empirical nature of the Anglican Church, as it appeared especially in the resistance to the Oxford Movement, constructs the most mordant criticism of the system of a State Church. These lectures, in which Newman's style comes out in its full brilliancy, show him also as a master of invective in a still higher degree than do the earlier anti-Roman treatises.

Another of the seceders from Anglicanism, F. Oakeley, published his reminiscences in the *Dublin Review* for 1863–64; they were reprinted later with the title, 'Historical Notes on the Tractarian Movement' (London, 1865). In these he also describes his attempt before going over to translate into practice, as one of

[1] W. Ward, *W. G. Ward and the Oxford Movement*, pp. 244 f.

[2] This is in spite of the denial in his preface that he is describing a definite individual, or attempting to represent the religious opinions which had lately so much influence in the University of Oxford.

[3] This is the first of two volumes in Newman's collected works, *Certain Difficulties, felt by Anglicans in Catholic Teaching, considered* (Preface dated 1860).

the first, the principles of Tractarianism. Naturally he writes from a Roman Catholic standpoint, and his account is thus the opposite pole to Palmer's. A middle path between these two works is kept by 'The Autobiography of Isaac Williams,'[1] the author of which closely resembled his teacher Keble, was at one time strongly influenced by Newman, but definitely refused to follow him to the bitter end. The same may be said of Thomas Mozley's often quoted 'Reminiscences, chiefly of Oriel College and the Oxford Movement' (2 vols., London, 1882), which, however, is little more than an entertaining collection of anecdotes, far from always being reliable in its statements, and showing a deplorable lack of understanding in the author for the deepest impulses of the Movement, of which he was a devout adherent, and an uncritical acceptance of its prejudices.[2]

Of earlier attempts to represent the Tractarian phase of the Neo-Anglican Movement, we need only mention H. G. Newland, 'Three Lectures on Tractarianism' (1852), a panegyric of the Movement by a devoted supporter.[3] This and the numerous contributions scattered about in pamphlets and other ephemeral literature are put in the shade by R. W. Church, 'The Oxford Movement. Twelve Years, 1833–1845,' posthumously published in 1891. This is, and will continue to be, the classical High Anglican work. The author, at his death Dean of St. Paul's,[4] had been himself in the inner council-chamber of the Movement in its later phase, and a life-long friendship united him to Newman. Moreover, he went to work with a fund of humanistic and literary culture and a personal refinement, which made him perhaps the most highly esteemed Churchman of his generation. His 'moral beauty' has become proverbial. Thus he could give to the ecclesiastical literature of his country one of its classical works, and also in the form of history defend the views he himself shared, all the more effectively, as his defence has none of the notes of a partisan treatise. However, this does not exclude the possibility that the twelve years in his narrative stand out, as it were, in a glorified light, not quite in

[1] Edited by George Prevost (London, 1892).

[2] Thus, *e.g.*, his treatment of Hampden is typical.

[3] E. G. K. Browne, *Annals of the Tractarian Movement from* 1842 *to* 1860 (3rd ed., London, 1861), writes from the point of view of a Catholic convert.

[4] R. W. Church, born 1815, Fellow of Oriel 1838, spent nearly twenty years in a country parish before he became Dean of St. Paul's in 1871, and died in 1890. Had he consented he might have had the highest post in his Church. His life is by his daughter, Mary C. Church, *Life and Letters of Dean Church* (London, 1894). See also D. C. Lathbury, *Dean Church* in 'Leaders of Religion' (London, 1905).

harmony with the picture which results from a cooler and more impartial observation.[1]

The literature after Church may fitly be divided into four groups: (1) High Anglican; (2) Low Church and Nonconformist; (3) Roman Catholic; finally, one ought to add as a fourth, Continental Protestant. The last gives hardly any contribution of apparent value to the history of the Movement: its interest only consists in showing how Continental Protestantism reacted against Neo-Anglicanism.

(1) In 1895 appeared G. Wakeling, 'The Oxford Movement. Sketches and Recollections,' a poorly put together collection of anecdotes, of greater interest for the later (ritualistic) phase of High Anglicanism than for the Tractarian. C. T. Cruttwell, 'Six Lectures on the Oxford Movement and its Results on the Church of England' (London, 1899), gives a moderate but sympathetic estimate. J. H. Overton, 'The Anglican Revival' (London, 1897), offers a clear, concise, and comprehensive treatment of the whole Neo-Anglican (or Anglo-Catholic, if the word is preferred) Movement, and treats the Oxford Movement as its first phase. A handy conspectus, sober and temperate in its judgment, is Sir Samuel Hall, 'A Short History of the Oxford Movement' (London, 1907). A sympathetic study, written with all the author's personal and stylistic charm, can be found in H. Scott Holland's introduction to the edition of 'Lyra Apostolica' in 'The Library of Devotion,' later reprinted with the title, 'The Mission of the Oxford Movement' in 'Personal Studies' (1905). As a sort of summary of the traditional conception, which took shape and lives in the High Church camp in our own day, may be quoted S. L. Ollard, 'A Short History of the Oxford Movement' (1915).[2] Under this somewhat inappropriate title is included a presentation of the whole High Church Movement down to the present day. The conception is rather shallow and partial; for the ritualistic development, which is drawn broadly and *con amore*, more important things take an inferior place; and the author overlooks the gulf which divides the Tractarian and later

[1] In connection with Church we must mention here two collections of memoirs and letters, which give various contributions to the history of the Movement (and also to Newman's biography): (1) *Letters of Frederic, Lord Blachford*, edited by G. E. Marindin (London, 1896). F. Rogers, Fellow of Oriel, later Lord Blachford, was one of Newman's closest friends. (2) *Memorials of W. C. Lake, Dean of Durham*, edited by Katharine Lake (1901). Of importance for information about the conservative party in the Church, which, at first in sympathy with the Movement, was later offended by its development, is W. R. W. Stephens, *Life and Letters of W. F. Hook* (1878).

[2] By the same author there is a short survey of the Oxford Movement in Hastings' *Dictionary of Religion and Ethics*.

'Catholic' movement. Also he makes the ritualistic development play a greater part than the extensive remoulding of Church conception and Church practice which has affected the whole Church, and not merely a part of it as ritualism has done, and which alone can assure to the Oxford Movement its place of honour in English Church History. As a type of a group of popular presentations, in which these weaknesses come out in still higher degree, may be quoted a book like C. Kelway, 'The Catholic Revival' (London, 1915).[1]

(2) If High Churchmen paint their own Movement in rosy colours, when they write its history, their opponents have seldom shown themselves capable of impartial presentation, but only too often have exhibited an entire inability to appreciate its real value, at times even an officious and gossipy suspiciousness, which even in innocent things has been ready to trace idolatry or Jesuitism. Typical of this writing of history which has too much the character of spiteful special pleading is W. Walsh, 'The Secret History of the Oxford Movement' (London, 1897), where without any proper attempt at a historical estimate, the whole High Church development stands out as a series of secret plots designed from the first to subject England to Rome. The author continued his unveiling in 'History of the Romeward Movement in the Church of England, 1833–1864' (London, 1900). Somewhat less naive, but little juster, is the historical presentation in M. McCarthy, 'Church and State in England and Wales, 1829–1906' (Dublin and London, 1906). Certainly it would take long to enumerate all the partisan writings of history which saw the light of day during the long struggle on this side. From Nonconformist quarters we must single out two important works, one by a Wesleyan, J. H. Rigg, 'Oxford High Anglicanism' (2nd ed., London, 1899), which, in spite of its attitude of critical antipathy on the whole, yet is not without understanding of the subject, and one by a Congregationalist, A. M. Fairbairn, 'Catholicism, Roman and Anglican' (London, 1899), which on a broad basis of philosophy of religion studies the whole process in the thought of the nineteenth century, of which the Oxford Movement is a phase. This is one of the most important contributions to an estimate of the Neo-Anglican Movement, distinguished as much by breadth of view as by critical acumen, and also by a considerable stylistic art. The author willingly recognises the actual significance of the Neo-Anglican Movement for English religion,

[1] For the sake of completeness we may also mention two other more popular works—A. B. Donaldson, *Five Great Oxford Leaders: Keble, Newman, Pusey, Liddon, and Church* (London, 1903); and W. H. Carey, *The Story of the Oxford Movement* (London, 1910).

while he sharply criticises its Church conception and philosophy of religion.[1]

(3) A movement which brought to Rome such converts as Newman and Manning, and seemed to prepare the ground for a reunion on a far greater scale, was naturally sure to be followed with the greatest interest from the Roman Catholic side. This was most closely connected with the great personalities, and in the form of biography we have received the most important contribution to our subject given by an English Catholic from Wilfrid Ward in the first of the books in which he described his father's life, 'William George Ward and the Oxford Movement' (London, 1889).[2] The most important of the biographies of Newman have been quoted in another context.[3] Ward's book is especially important as throwing light on the extreme Romanising wing, to which W. G. Ward belongs and which he inspired, and also as an analysis of the philosophic side of the Movement, the significance of which he emphasised more than anyone else. We may also mention S. Purcell's 'Life of Cardinal Manning' (1896). This much debated work has recently been supplemented and corrected by S. Leslie's 'Henry Edward Manning, his Life and Work' (London, 1921). From Roman Catholic circles we also have the chief connected account of the whole Neo-Anglican Movement which has hitherto come out, in P. Thureau-Dangin, 'La renaissance catholique en Angleterre au XIX^e^ siècle' (3 vols., Paris, 1899–1906). Though he naturally regards the High Church development as a gradual acceptance of the entirety of 'Catholic' truth, and this has caused him to some extent to pass over the Anglican for the Catholic side of the Movement—one misses a clear orientation of its antecedents in Anglican tradition—yet the actual historical presentation is clear and valuable. The author

[1] I quote Fairbairn's judgment on the remoulding of divine service in England: 'The religious spirit of England is, in all its sections and varieties, sweeter to-day than it was forty years ago, more open to the ministries of art and the graciousness of order, possessed by a larger sense of the community of the Saints, the kinship and the continuity of the Christian Society in all ages. Even Scotland has been touched with a strange softness, Presbyterian worship has grown less bald, organs and liturgies have found a home in the land and Church of Knox, and some of the more susceptible of the sons of the Covenant have been visited by the ideal of a Church at once British and Catholic, where prelate and presbyter should dwell together in unity' (*ibid.* p. 73).

[2] The sequel of this is the description of Ward's life as a Catholic—*W. G. Ward and the Catholic Revival* (1893). Even in 1841 W. G. Ward had, by articles in *L'Univers*, drawn the attention of the Catholic Press to the hopeful development of Neo-Anglicanism.

[3] We may add A. Capecelatro, *Newman e La Religione Cattolica in Inghilterra* (2 vols., Napoli and Bologna, 1859).

has a particularly striking remark on the obstinate Protestantism of which even the ritualistic movement bears witness.[1]

(4) Among the Protestant works of the Continent we may quote first a work contemporary with the Movement: A. de Mestral, 'L'école théologique d'Oxford, Recueil de documents' (Lausanne, 1843), which gives a clear and systematic conspectus of the Tractarian system, conceived chiefly in the spirit of Pusey, though, of course, the author takes pains to explain away the Tractarian condemnation of Continental Protestantism.[2] Of later works in French we will only quote an essay by L. Bastide, 'Le Mouvement ritualiste Anglican' (Paris, 1890).

German literature is remarkably poor:[3] I know no German monograph, and the chapters relevant in handbooks of Church history are generally not very successful, sometimes misleading. One of the most interesting accounts in German of the theological development in England during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries is in O. Pfleiderer, 'Die Entwicklung der protestantischen Theologie in Deutschland seit Kant und im Grossbritannien seit 1825' (Freiburg im B., 1891; an English edition was published in 1889 before the German). His attention is, however, chiefly directed to the history of philosophic thought and of critical theology, so that the problem which occupies us gets a very scanty treatment. More important is the view presented by H. Böhmer in a lecture, printed in an enlarged form in 'Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift' (27th series, H. 8 and 9), 'Die Kirche von England und der Protestantismus.' Buddensieg's article 'Traktarianismus' in Herzog-Hauck's 'Realencyclopädie' is probably best of all. The subject has been treated in a Danish dissertation, by C. E. Fl*ø*ystrup, 'Den Anglo-

[1] 'Tous les Clergymen qui ont modifié dans ce sens, et parfois si complètement, le culte et l'enseignement dogmatique de leur Eglise, l'ont fait par leur volonté propre, j'allais dire suivant leur fantaisie, chacun dans la mesure qui lui convenait, sans l'autorisation, souvent contre la volonté de leurs chefs hiérarchiques, de sorte qu'on peut presque dire qu'ils ne se sont jamais montrés plus protestants que quand ils ont manifesté leurs sympathies pour les idées et les formes catholiques' (*op. cit.* vol. i., Introd. p. xlvii). The book has been translated into English, *The English Catholic Revival in the Nineteenth Century* (2 vols., 1914).

[2] Mestral's work is intended to be an answer to a very polemical lecture by J. H. Merle d'Aubigné, *Genève et Oxford* (Genève, 1842).

[3] Among contemporary German accounts of the English Church in the nineteenth century we may mention O. v. Gerlach, *Ueber den religiösen Zustand der Anglikanischen Kirche im Jahre* 1842; *Amtlicher Bericht . . . dem Minister der geistlichen Angelegenheiten erstattet* (Potsdam, 1845). Here is only a passing reference to the Oxford Movement, which is judged from an Evangelical standpoint. Uhden, *Die Zustände in der Anglikanischen Kirche* (Leipzig, 1843), gives us also a critical view of 'Puseyism.'

katholske Bevaegelse i det nittende Aarhundrede' (Copenhagen, 1891).

Lastly, I may be suffered to add a few words on the Swedish literature of the subject, although this has more importance for Swedish than for English Church History. The earliest essay of any importance is in 'Ecclesiastik Tidskrift,' edited by C. E. Fahlcrantz, A. R. Knös, and C. J. Almqvist. Here, in 1839,[1] in a signed review, 'Pusey's Letter to the Bishop of Oxford' is dealt with by a writer who, to a temperate and not altogether unsympathetic judgment of Pusey, adds the following: 'One is as much repelled by this once for all stiffened theology, as by the never-resting distortions of the Germans. . . . The light is neither an emanation which is darkened in course of time, nor has it been bound in chaos, till it has now burst out in all its splendour. The Oxford repristination and the German rationalism are equally wrong.' The same journal for 1842 contains a somewhat fuller essay on Puseyism by F(ahlcrantz). He correctly sees the peculiarity of the Oxford Movement in its attempt to maintain Anglicanism both against Rome and against Dissenters, but holds that this could only succeed on an essentially Catholic basis: 'The more Romanising phenomena have their reason in the irresistible power of delusions contained in the Anglican Creed concentrated in the notion of the traditional sanctity of Church and doctrine.' This doubtless contains a correct observation, though one might have preferred a different formulation. The author's prophecy, 'That such an ambiguous creation as Anglicanism, this mixture of formal untruth and material truth, cannot last, seems certain,' has in any case not yet been fulfilled.

In 1843 C. F. av Wingård, in his 'Öfversigt af Christna kyrkans senare händelser och nuvarande tillstånd,' deals with the Tractarian idea of the Catholicity of the Church and the doctrine of *successio apostolica*. He shows his knowledge, though in arbitrary selection, of a good many contemporary polemical writings. As usual in foreign literature Pusey, not Newman, is prominent. The same may be said of an essay by H. Reuterdahl (with exactly the same title as Wingård's just quoted work) in 'Tidskrift för Svenska Kyrkan,' 1849, edited by L. A. Anjou and A. F. Beckman. This shows a remarkable knowledge of Anglican theology even of the latest times. In connection therewith we may mention C. A. Torén's 'Bref från utlandet,' in the same periodical for 1850: he is charmed by the English service but at the same time points out its defects. The episcopalism of High Churchmen offends him: 'The readiness one of these Churchmen expressed to me to recognise

[1] Pp. 157 f., *En af dagens frågor i Engelska Kyrkan.*

the Swedish Church as such a branch (of the whole Christian Church) made on me far from the impression that was intended, while in this recognition was revealed too plainly the deplorably exclusive, not to say Pharisaic spirit of the important man and of his party.' But Torén does not seem to have become better acquainted with the peculiar character of the modern Highchurchmanship. With special reference to Swedish conditions, A. N. Sundberg wrote in 'Svensk Kyrkotidning' for 1857 on 'Engelsk högkyrklighet och lågkyrklighet.' The author's own standpoint seems to have directed his interest to the parties of the English Church. He tries to investigate the content of the terms in the connections to which they belong, 'when it will appear how far the same epithets are applicable to our own conditions.' The essay shows an acquaintance with the history of the English Church since the Reformation which does credit to a Swedish theologian. His own sympathies are with High Churchmen of the older type, whose agreement with Lutheranism, especially in Sacramental doctrine, he establishes. The discussion of 'Puseyism' is not free from mistakes and partiality, but contains some striking observations.[1] In C. A. Agardh's 'Samlade skrifter af blandadt innehåll' (Lund, 1863) is an essay on Puseyism, the order and clearness of which are what one would expect of its author, but it does not go deep, and builds upon a very scanty material. Along with the High Church currents in the middle of the century within the Swedish Church, the interest of Swedish theological enquiry in the development of the English High Church Movement languished, to be revived by fresh and kindred movements in Swedish Church life of to-day. The most valuable specimen of the interest thus revived is in S. Gabrielson's 'Kyrkostudier från långfärd och bokvärld' (Uppsala, 1910), which gives a correct and readable sketch of the genesis and course of the Oxford Movement.

[1] *E.g.*, when on Justification he observes: 'The position of Tertullian that Baptism is certainly the first condition of salvation, and imparts complete forgiveness of sins, but that for all sins after baptism penance is difficult and forgiveness uncertain, has been developed by Puseyism in a Pelagian direction.' This may be borrowed from O. v. Gerlach (*op. cit.* p. 105).

# INDEX


ABBOTT, E. A., *Anglican Career of Cardinal Newman*, 109 *n*, 111 *n*[1]
Act of Uniformity, 4
à Kempis, Thomas, 297
Alexander, Dr. M., consecrated Bishop of Jerusalem, 162
Ambrose, 296
Andrewes, Bishop, 22, 152, 181, 246; view of the Eucharist, 314–15
Anglican Christianity and the requirement of holiness, 231
Anglican Church, the: under Elizabeth, 1, 2; under Stuarts, 4; during the Restoration, 4, 5; effects of religious differentiation in, 4; the Anglican Renaissance, 5–6; condition of, before 1833, 6 *et seq.*; the liturgy, 10; the place of Communion in divine service, 10–11; revenues, 12–13; pluralism, 12, 13, 14, 15
  Organisation of, in early nineteenth century, 11–14; comparison with Middle Ages, 13, 14; the radical changes in, 14, 94–5
  Protestantism of, 1; influence of Continental Protestantism on, 2, 4
Anglican piety, characteristics of, 4–5
Anglicanism in the eighteenth century, 16
Antinomianism, 32
Apollinarianism, 303
Apollinaris of Laodicea, 223, 224
Apostolic succession, the doctrine of, 129, 180; in the older Anglican Church, 181–2; in Neo-Anglicanism, 182–4, 185 *and* $n^1$, 186, 192, 193, in *Tracts for the Times*, 181, 185–9, 191, 202; divergence from primitive doctrine, 186; Tractarian scripture proof, 186, 187, 188; proof from probability, 188–9
Apostolicals, the, 123, 149
Arnold, Matthew, *Rugby Chapel*, 87
Arnold, Thomas, 78, 86–92
  *Fragments on Church and State*, 92 *and* $n^1$
  *Principles of Church Reform*, 88–92, 93
  'The Oxford Malignants' 86, 143, 284 $n^2$
  mentioned, 94, 99, 117, 149, 160
Arsenius, Metropolitan of Thebais, 18 $n^2$
Ashley, Lord, 162
Avrillon, Jean-Baptiste-Élie, works by, 175 *and* $n^1$, 297

BAGOT, Bishop of Oxford, 144–5, 158, 167
Bancroft, Archbishop, 181 *and* $n^2$
Baptism, Baptismal Regeneration, 266, 305 *et seq.*
  Augustinian view of, 314
  Infants, of, 310
  Newman's views, 305 *and n*, 323 $n^1$
  Post-baptismal sin, 308, 311 *and* $n^3$
  Pusey's *Scriptural Views of Holy Baptism*, 308 *et seq.*
  Sacramental validity of, 307
  Tractarian doctrine of, 229, 266, 305, 308 *et seq.*
Barrington, Shute, Bishop of Durham, 37
Baxter's *Christian Directory*, 231
Bellasis, E., *Memorials of Mr. Serjeant Bellasis, cited*, 172 $n^1$
Benefices, cumulative holding of. *See* Pluralism
Bentham, 93, 99, 150
Bernard, T. D., *Autobiographical Notes, quoted*, 212 $n^2$
Beveridge, William, Bishop of St. Asaph, 17, 134 *and* $n^2$ *and* $n^5$, 306 $n^1$, 316, 317
Blachford, Lord, 136 $n^3$, 337 $n^1$
  *Letters of Frederic, Lord Blachford*, 136 $n^2$, 337 $n^1$

Black Book, The (1820), 13
Blasius, 297
Blomfield, Charles James, Bishop of London, 96 *and* $n^1$, 161
Bloxam, Dr., 151 $n^1$
Böhme, Jakob, 18
Böhmer, H., *Die Kirche Englands und der Protestantismus*, 329 $n^2$, 340
Bonaventura, 297, 298
Bossuet, 18, 134 $n^5$
Bowden, J. W., 131, 141 $n^1$, 163, 191 $n^1$
*Life of Pope Gregory the Seventh*, 142 *and* $n^2$
*Tracts for the Times No.* 5, 131, 185 *and* $n^2$
Bremond, H., *L'Inquiétude religieuse*, 147 $n^3$
*Newman, cited and quoted*, 106 $n^2$, 109 *n*, 111 *n*, 139 $n^2$, 217 $n^2$
Bricknell, W. S. *The Judgment of the Bishops upon Tractarian Theology, cited*, 164 $n^2$
British and Foreign Bible Society, 38
*British Critic*, 142, 175, 176, 269
*British Magazine*, 28, 100 *and* $n^1$, 135, 141, 160, 206
Browne, E. G. K., *Annals of the Tractarian Movement*, 336 $n^3$
Buddensieg, *Traktarianismus*, 340
Bull, George, Bishop of St. David's, 134 *and* $n^5$
*Harmonia Apostolica*, 278 *and nn*
mentioned, 17, 55, 115, 278, 279, 306 *and* $n^1$, 316
Bunsen, C. C. J., Baron von, 161 *and* $n^2$, 162
Butler, Bishop
*Analogy of Religion*, 21, 72, 112, 189 *and* $n^2$, 231, 295
Conversation with Wesley on Justification, 279 $n^3$
Newman's indebtedness to, 21, 189 *and* $n^2$

CAMBRIDGE, influence of Evangelicalism on, 39
Camden Society, 206
Carlsson, G. W., articles on Puseyism, *cited*, 325 $n^4$
Carlyle, 149
Caroline Anglicanism, 21–2, 202, 231
Eucharistic doctrine in, 314–16
Casuistry, Anglican, 231 *and* $n^5$
Catechism, the alterations in, of 1604, 315 $n^7$
*Catena Patrum*, 137, 152, 181 $n^2$, 306 $n^2$
Catherine of Siena, 297
Catholic Emancipation, 95, 96 $n^1$, 133, 204
Celibacy, 246
Chandler, J., 160 $n^5$
Chateaubriand, 57
Chester, diocese of, 11
*Christian Observer*, 38
Christian perfection, ideal of, 230
*Christian Remembrancer, The*, 176
*Christian Year, The*, 206, 208, 215 $n^1$, 317
Church, R. W., 178, 336 *and* $n^4$
Criticism of Stokes' article on 'Alexander Knox and the Oxford Movement,' 331–2
On Knox and Jebb's influence on the Oxford Movement, 331–2
*The Oxford Movement: Twelve Years*, 6 $n^1$, 8, 136 $n^4$, 212 $n^1$, 332, 336; quoted, 8, 103–4
Church building affected by the Napoleonic Wars, 12
Church Building Act, 12
Church Building Society, 12, 25
Church buildings, symbolism of, 324
Church, English: *See under headings* Anglican, High Church, etc.
Church Missionary Society, 38
Church Pluralities Act, 15
Church reunion, 197, 330
Church Temporalities Bill (1833), 98, 100
*Churchman's Manual, The*, 129, 184, 185 *and* $n^1$
Churton, 165
'Clapham sect,' the, 37–8, 53
'Clapton sect,' the, 25
Clement of Alexandria, 297
Coleridge, J. T., 62, 63–8, 165 $n^2$
Conception of nature, 68
*Aids to Reflection*, 64
*Ancient Mariner*, 68–9
*Confessions of an Enquiring Spirit*, 64
*On the Constitution of Church and State*, 64–8, 202
mentioned, 10, 82, 91, 202, 332, 333
Communicants, number of, 10 $n^1$
Communion, increased frequency of, 326–7
Comte, *cited*, 177 $n^1$
Continental Protestantism, 154, 197, 201 $n^1$
Influence of, on Anglican Church, 2, 4, 31
Conversion:
Evangelical preaching of, 305
Methodist teaching of, 279
Tractarianism, in, 229, 312

Convocations, suppression of, 20; revival, 203
Cope, Rev. Sir William, Bart., *cited*, 213 *n*[1]
Copeland, *cited*, 175 *n*[3], 236 *n*[2]
Copleston, Edward (Provost of Oriel, Bishop of Llandaff), 78–9
Cornish, *English Church in the Nineteenth Century, cited*, 12 *nn*, 13*nn*
Corporation Act, 94, 95
Cosin, John, Bishop of Durham, 134 *n*[3], 315, 317
*Historia Transubstantiationis papalis*, 134
Cowper, William, 33
Cranmer, 1, 50 *n*[2], 121, 181, 316
Crashaw, 70
Cruttwell, C. T., *Six Lectures on the Oxford Movement*, 337
Cyril of Jerusalem, 302

DALGAIRNS, J. D., 149 *and n*[4], 178
Daubeny, Archdeacon, 12, 45
*Guide to the Church*, 23–5 *and nn*, 182
*Vindiciae Ecclesiae Anglicanae*, 24 *n*[1]
Davenport, Christopher, 154 *n*[1]
*Deus, Natura, Gratia, etc.*, 154 *n*[1]
De Brome, Adam, 104, 139
Deism, 121, 279
De Maistre, 57
De Vere, Aubrey, *quoted*, 105
'Dies Irae,' 58
Digby, K. H., 57
Dionysius Areopagita, 302 *n*[3]
Dissenters, 121, 191 *and n*[1], 266 *n*[3], 267
Dodwell, 17
Döllinger, *cited*, 177 *n*[1], 282 *n*

ECCLESIASTICAL Commissioners, 15
Reports of, 12 *n*[1], 14
Ecclesiasticism, 45
Eden, C. P., 133
Tract No. 32, *quoted*, 194 *n*[1]
*Edinburgh Review, The*, 37, 38, 143, 144 *n*[1]
Edward II, 104
Enthusiasm, 8, 9, 39, 46, 52, 224 *n*[4], 225
Erasmus, 36
Erastianism, 20, 86 *n*[2]
*Essays and Reviews*, 78
Established Church Bill, The, 13
Eucharist:
High Church view, 317
Pre-Tractarian views, 314–17
Eucharist—*cont.*
Tractarian views of, 314, 318 *et seq.*; dualism in, 317; developments in later Neo-Anglicanism, 322
Evangelical Movement, the, 15, 31, 45, 211; influence of Continental Protestantism on, 31
Evangelicalism, 29 *et seq.*, 59, 225, 230, 249, 250 *n*[1], 252
Church, the conception of, in, 41
Neo-Anglicanism, influence on, 32 *et seq.*, 42–3, 242, 243, 244
Spiritual factor, as, 40
Eveleigh, John, 77 *n*[1]
'Extraordinary Black Book, The' (1831), 13

FABER, F. W., 149 *and n*[4], 178
Fairbairn, H. M., *Catholicism, Roman and Anglican*, 95 *n*, 99 *n*[2], 338, 339 *and n* [1]
Faussett, Dr., 165
Ferrar, Nicholas, 246
Figgis, J. N., 203 *n*[1]
Flǿystrup, C. E., *Den Anglo-katholske Bevaegelse*, 340
Forgiveness of Sins, 321 *n*[2]
Forster, C., *Life of John Jebb*, 40 *n*[1]; quoted, 55 *n*[1]
Frederick William IV of Prussia, 161
French Revolution, 93
French Romanism, influences of, 327
Froude, Archdeacon, 118
Froude, James Anthony, 105, 118, 171
*Nemesis of Faith*, 171 *n*[1], 212 *n*[1]
*Short Studies*, quoted, 118, 122 *n*[4], 212 *n*[1], 222 *n*; cited, 124 *n*[3]
Froude, Richard Hurrell, 118 *et seq.*, 217 *n*[3], 240 *n*[3], 246, 247–8; friendship with Newman, 112, 122, *and n*[3]; influence on Newman, 112, 118, 122, 123; and Keble, 123
Apostolic succession, idea of, 180, 182–3, 189–90
Asceticism of, 119–20, 247–8
Christian conduct, views on, 238 *et seq.*, 243; Pelagianism in, 242, 275
Enthusiasm, attitude to, 224 *and n*[4]
Motive of obedience, the, on, 229–30
*Remains* of, 118 *n*[1], 123, 142, 144, 183 *and n*[1], 212, 247–8, 259; *cited and quoted*, 119–23 *passim*, 180 *n*[2], 182, 183, 189 *n*[3], 204–6, 216 *n*[2], 224, 229, 239–42
Sermons and diaries of, 212. *For individual sermons see under heading* Sermons

Froude, Richard Hurrell—*cont.*
State Church, the, on, 203–5
*Via Media*, conception of an Anglican, 122
Writings of :
*Thomas Becket*, 142, 206
*Tracts for the Times*, contributions to, 131, 134, 205 *n*²

Newman *quoted* on, 122 *and n*², 138

Otherwise mentioned, 19 *n*², 71, 76, 82 *n*¹, 95, 113, 128, 132, 141 *n*¹, 171, 184, 188, 275, 308

GERMAN Pietism, 249 *and n*³
Gibbon, 19
Gladstone, W. E.
appreciation of Evangelicalism, 42–3
on the Oxford Movement, 43
signs protest in Pusey's heresy suit, 165 *n*²
on condemnation of Tract xc, 178
*Gleanings of Past Years*, 42–3, 81*n*³
*The State in its Relation with the Church*, 68

cited and quoted, 150 *n*¹, 177 *n*¹, 232 *n*¹, 333 *n*³

Golightly, C. P., 155
Goode, W., on Infant Baptism, 306 *nn*
Gorham case, 138 *n*¹, 307
Görres, 57
Gregory of Nazianzum, 297, 320
*Greville Memoirs*, *cited* 97 *n*³, *quoted* 96 *n*¹
Grey, Lord, 96, 97, 98, 99 *and n*¹
Grundtvig, view of objective regeneration in Baptism, 307 *and n*³
*Guardian, The*, 136 *n*²
Guillemard, 178
Guiney, L. I., *Hurrell Froude : Memoranda and Comments*, 118*n*¹

HACK, Rev. B. S., 213 *n*¹
'Hackney phalanx,' the, 26
Hadleigh conference, the, 128–9, 184, 205 *n*⁶
Hales, J., Calvinistic view of the Eucharist, 315 *n*⁷
Hall, Sir Samuel, *A Short History of the Oxford Movement*, 130 *n*, 337
Hamilton, Sir William, 82
Hammond, 315
Hampden, Renn Dickson, 78, 92, 142–3, 164, 336 *n*²
Bampton Lectures of, 92, 142, 300*n*¹
*Observations on Religious Dissent*, 142
Hare, Julius, 92
Harrison, B., 132, 332
*The Scripture View of the Apostolic Commission* (Tract No. 24), 186–7
Harvey, W. G., *Ecclesiae Anglicanae, etc.*, 201 *n*²
Hawkins, Edward, Provost of Oriel, 78, 79–81, 165
Influence on Newman, 80–1, 307
Newman *quoted* on, 80
Sermon on *The Apostolic Succession*, 81 *and n*

otherwise mentioned, 84, 92, 199

Headlam, A. C., *The Doctrine of the Church and Christian Reunion*, 186 *n*
Henson, H. H., *Studies in English Religion, etc.*, 2 *n*¹, 231 *n*⁵
Herbert, George, 70
Hermas' conception of penance, 311
Hierarchy of the Church in the eighteenth century, 20
High Church movement, the, 5 *n*²
High Church tradition, the, 15
High Churchmanship, 21 ; arraignment of, by A. Knox, 52
Holiness the most essential note of the Church, 260, 263
Holland, H. Scott, 337
Holy Club, the, 30
Homilies, Anglican, the, 279, 318
Hook, W. F., 159, 165 *and n*³
Hooker, Richard :
Apostolic Succession, *quoted* on, 181 *and n* ⁴
*Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, 2–4 *and nn*, 65, 86, 88, 95
Sermon : 'A Learned Discourse of Justification, etc.,' *quoted*, 277 *and nn*
*The Works of Richard Hooker*, edited by John Keble, 3 *n*, 123 *nn*, 277 *n*²
Horsley, Bishop, 25 *n*¹
Hort A. F., *cited*, 128
Hort, F. J. A., *quoted* on Newman, 111 *n*¹
Howley, Archbishop, 97, 98, 161
Hutton, R. H., *Cardinal Newman*, 109 *n*, *quoted* 282 *n*, *cited* 258 *n*¹
Hutton, W. H. (Dean of Winchester), Sketch of the literary history of the Oxford Movement, 334 *n*¹

Individualism, 56
Industrialism, rise of, 11
Inge, Very Rev. W. R., *Faith*, 197 $n^4$
*Outspoken Essays*, 5 $n^1$, 109 *n*, 173 *nn*
Inglis, Sir Robert, 95
Irenaeus, 297, 320
Irish Church dioceses, 12 $n^1$
Irish Church question, 97–9, 131
Irving, Edward, 158, 306–7

Jackson, Thomas, 315
Jager, Abbé, 55 $n^1$, 139, 140
James, W., Fellow of Oriel, 182
Jansenism, 103
Jebb, John, Bishop of Limerick, 45, 53, 81; influence of, on the Oxford Leaders, 47 $n^2$, 331–3
*Appendix, relating to the Character of the Church of England*, 53–5 *and nn*, 80 $n^3$, 333
*Correspondence* with Alexander Knox, 47 *and* $n^1$, 52 $n^2$, 53 *and* $n^3$
*Essay on Sacred Literature*, 53 $n^2$
otherwise mentioned, 9, 25, 40, 133, 181 $n^2$, 182
Jelf, Rev. R. W., 160, 165
Newman's letter to, in defence of Tract XC., 157
Pusey's letter to, in defence of Tract XC., 160
Jerusalem Bishopric, the, 161–2
attitude of the episcopate to, 164 $n^2$
Jewel, 2 *and* $n^2$, 3, 197
Johnson, John, *The Unbloody Sacrifice of the Altar Unveiled*, 316
Johnson, Samuel, 19
*quoted* on Apostolic Succession, 181 $n^2$
Jones, of Nayland, 33
Justification, Doctrine of, 274 *et seq.*
Catholic and Evangelical conceptions of, 274
Knox's influence on, 331, 333
Lutheran doctrine of, 274 *et seq. passim*
Justus Jonas, catechism of 1548, 181

Keble, John, 70–6, 77, 86, 123–4; characteristics of, 74, 124; Romantic vein in, 62, 71, 73, 295; High Anglicanism of, 23, 123, 128; influence on Froude, 76, 119; influence on Newman, 112; influence on the Neo-Anglican Movement, 123–4, 125, 128
Keble, John—*cont.*
Apostolic succession, on, 186, 194
Justification, on, 291 $n^2$
Mysticism, on, 152, 295 *and n.*
Reform movement, attitude to, 95, 100, 101, 102
State Church, view of the, 203 $n^3$
Tract xc., attitude to, 156, 160
Sermons, 190 $n^4$, 191 $n^2$, 194, 212 *and* $n^4$, 213 *and* $n^1$, 298 *n. For individual Sermons see also under heading* Sermons
*National Apostasy* (*Assize Sermon*), 6 $n^1$, 14, 76, 100–2, 123–4
Writings of:
*Christian Year, The*, 63, 71–3, 74–6, 126, 206, 295; poem, 'Gunpowder Treason,' 75 *and n*
*Lyra Apostolica*: contributions to, 100, 141 $n^1$, 206; poem 'The Churchman's Lamp,' 208–9, 210
*Lyra Innocentium*, 73
Sir Walter Scott, essay on, *quoted*, 60–2
*Tracts for the Times*: contributions to, 124 *and* $n^1$, 131, 152, 186, 194, 295 *and n.*
*Works, The, of Richard Hooker*, edition of, 3 *n*, 123 *and* $n^3$ *and* $^4$
Otherwise mentioned, 17 $n^2$, 19 $n^2$, 70, 72 $n^1$, 79, 80, 115, 134 $n^4$, 136 $n^3$, 142, 144, 174, 176, 184, 203, 232, 332 $n^2$
Keble, Thomas, 131
*Tract* 84, 152
Kelway, G., *The Story of the Catholic Revival, cited*, 8, 338
Ken, Bishop, 5 *and* $n^1$, 17, 22, 197
View of the Eucharist, 316
Kingsley, Charles, 109 *n*, 170 $n^4$
Knox, Alexander, 31, 35 $n^4$, 45–53; influence of, on the Oxford leaders considered, 47 $n^2$, 331–3
Conception of the Church, 47–53, 53 $n^3$
Love of the Liturgy, 50, 51 *and* $n^1$, 74, 152
Idea of apostolicity, 188 $n^1$
On the doctrine of the Eucharist, 50 $n^2$; mystical view of the Eucharist, 316 *and* $n^3$, 317 *and nn*
On Justification, 35 $n^4$, 51 $n^2$, 279–80
On Methodism in the Church, 52 *and* $n^2$, 53 $n^3$
Quoted on John Wesley, 46

Knox, Alexander—*cont.*
*Remains* of, 47 ; *cited and quoted*, 31 and *n*, 35 *n*⁴, 46–52 *passim*, 316 *n*³, 317 *nn*
mentioned, 133, 158, 164, 182, 230

LAKE, *Memorials of W. C. Lake*, 337 *n*¹
Lake School of Writers, the, 58, 62, 63, 158
Lamennais, 57
Laski, H. J., 'The Political Theory of the Oxford Movement,' 203 *n*¹
Latitudinarianism, 16
Laud, Archbishop, 4, 5, 174, 315
Laudianism, 16, 17
Law, William, 18 *and n*³, 19, 39, 230, 231, 246, 316
*A Serious Call, etc.*, 19 *and n*², 21
*Christian Perfection*, 19, 230
Legg, J. Wickham : *English Church Life, cited*, 10 *n*, 17 *n*¹
Leo, 296
Leslie, S. : *Henry Edward, Cardinal Manning*, 138 *n*¹, 339
Liberal Movement in the Church : different conceptions of, 6–8
Liberal reform, period of, 93 *et seq.*
*Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology*, 142
*Library of the Fathers*, 138 *n*³, 141 *and nn*, 174, 201 *n*²
Liddon, H. P., *Life of E. B. Pusey, D.D.*, 125 *n*¹ ; *cited or quoted*, 60, 108 *n*, 125 *n*², 126, 156 *n*², 167 *n*³, 311 *n*³, 317 *and n*³ *et passim* ; *quoted* on Alexander Knox, 332
Littlemore, Newman's settlement at, 166–7, 247
Liturgy, the, in the Eighteenth century Church, 10
Llandaff, diocese of, 11
Lloyd, Dr. (Regius Professor of Divinity, afterwards Bishop of Oxford), 25 *n*¹, 120–1, 125, 126
Lockhart, W., 106 *and n*¹, 171 *and n*²
London, churches of, 12
Loofs, *Leitfaden, cited*, 283 *n*², 250 *n*⁴, 260 *n*
Loyola's *Exercitia*, 151
Lüber, Thomas, 86 *n*²
Luther, 30, 36, 50, 121, 139, 176, 278, 290 *n*¹, 309
*De Captivitate Babylonica*, 310 *n*³, 312 *nn*
Eutychianism of, 300 *n*¹
Influences of, in Evangelicalism, 30, 31, 35–6
*Lyra Apostolica*, 76, 100 *and n*¹, 107, 135, 141 *and n*¹, 160, 191 *n*¹, 205 *n*⁵, 206–7, 209 *n*¹, 210, 259 *n*, 337

MACAULAY, Zachary, 37
McCarthy, M., *Church and State, etc.*, 338
Macmullen case, *cited*, 164 *n*³
Manners-Sutton, Archbishop, 13
Manning, Henry Edward, 43, 137, 138 *and n*¹, 246 *n*¹
Predestination and holiness in teaching of, 262–4
*Sermons* of, 213, 251 *n*³, 255 *n*³, 256 *n*¹, 262, 263 *nn*. *For individual sermons see under heading* Sermons
*Unity, the, of the Church*, 263 *n*⁴
Mant, R., Bishop, 181 *n*², 306 *and n*⁴
Manzoni, 61, 148 *n*²
Marsh, Bishop, 25 *n*¹
Martindale, *Calendar of the English Church*, 22
Martineau, Harriet, *quoted*, 12
Mathieson, *English Church Reform, cited*, 11, 13
Mayers, Walter, 32
Marriott, Charles, 138 *and n*², 141, 213
Mechanics' Institutes, 93
'Meetingers,' the, 191, 267
Melanchthon, 50, 197, 290 *n*¹
Melbourne, Lord, 143
Menzies, J. A., 131
Merle d'Aubigné, *Genève et Oxford*, 294 *and n*¹, 340 *n*²
Mestral, A. de, *L'école théologique d'Oxford*, 340 *and n*²
Methodism :
Conversion, teaching of, in, 279
Jebb, Bishop, on, 53 *n*²
Justification, doctrine of, in, 279
Knox on, 52, 53 *n*²
Methodist movement, 19, 30–1, 103
Newman's estimate of, 34
Non-Jurors, the, and, 19 *and n*¹, 30
Mill, James, 93
Mill, John Stuart, 93, 150 *and n*¹, 177 *n*¹
Milman, Henry Hart, 92, 117, 149
*History of Latin Christianity*, 92
*History of the Jews*, 92
Milner, Isaac, 35, 36, 38, 39, 279
Milner, Joseph, 35, 36
*History of the Church of Christ*, 35 *and nn*, 36, 115 *n*²
Milton, 121

Mohammedanism, Pantheism in, 300
Möhler, J. A.:
Athanasius, work on, 329 $n^2$
*Die Einheit der Kirche*, 329 $n^1$
*Symbolik, etc.*, 329 *and nn*
Monasticism, revival of, 246–7
Moravian brotherhood, 30
More, Hannah, 38, 39, 45, 49, 51 $n^1$
Morton, Thomas, Bishop of Durham, 315
Mosheim's *Institutiones*, 54
Mozley, Anne, 135 $n^2$
Mozley, James Bowling, 135 *and* $n^2$
*Essays Historical and Theological*, 87 $n^2$
Mozley, T., 135 *and* $n^2$, 142
*Reminiscences*, 336 *and* $n^2$
Mysticism, 152, 295 *et seq.*
Pantheism, and, 299, 300

Napoleonic Wars, the, 12
National Assembly of the Church of England, 94–5, 203, 204
Neale, J. M., 206
Nelson, Robert, 17, 18
Neo-Anglican view of the Church of the eighteenth century, 20; conception of the Church, 24, 206
Neo-Anglicanism as the inheritor of Evangelicalism, 225; influence of Non-Jurors on, 19; influence of Jebb and Knox on, 333; influence of Wesley on, 231
Ascetic element in, 244
Cross, the: theology and mysticism of, in, 249
Pastoral zeal of, 225
Romanising tendency in, 272–3
Sacramental religion in, 296
Social passion, the, in, 271

*See also under headings*: Oxford Movement, Tractarian, Tractarian piety, etc.

Nepotism, examples of, 13
Newland, H. G., *Three Lectures on Tractarianism*, 336
Newman, Harriet, 135 $n^2$
Newman, John Henry, 79 *and* $n^1$, 80–4, 107–17
Anglican career: climax of, 146; last years of: resigns his living, 171–2; resigns Fellowship of Oriel, 174; secession, 124, 125, 138 *and* $n^2$, 174, 179
Anglicanism of, compared with that of Knox, 188 $n^1$
Newman, John Henry—*cont.*
Antiquity, reverence for, 218; on limits of antiquity in Primitive Tradition, 197–8
Apostolic succession, idea of, 180–9 *passim*, 192, 194
Baptismal regeneration, view of, 307; post-baptismal sin, 308 *and* $n^3$
Calvinism in. *See* Evangelicalism, *infra*
Development, idea of, 117
Early Church: conception of, 116, 117, 118
Evangelicalism: influence of, on, 32–5 *passim*, 43, 109–10, 111 $n^1$, 219, 233 $n^2$, 235, 252, 254–5; defection from, 80, 81, 307
Hampden, attack on, 140
Historian, characteristics as, 117–8
Jerusalem Bishopric, attitude to, 163 *and nn*, 168
Justification, doctrine of, 257
Keble, relation to: importance of, for the Neo-Anglican Movement, 123
Liberalism, attitude to, 79, 99 *and* $n^2$, 111, 116, 236
Littlemore, his Anglo-Catholic Settlement at, 166–7, 247
Mediterranean journey, 113, 116, 135
Methodism, estimate of, 34, 298 $n^1$
Monophysite controversy, study of, 147
Personal religion of, 110, 126, 215, 254
Personality of, 105–8, 140; self-centredness in, 106, 110
Preaching of, 192, 211–12, 212 $n^2$, 214; ascetic preaching, 247, 248
Predestination, idea of, in, 253, 254–7, 262; connection of his ascetic preaching with predestination, 254, 257
Protestantism, criticism of, 41
Religious genius, growth of, 107 *and* $n^2$, 108–17, 198–9, 219, 235–6; influence of Hawkins on, 80–1; influence of Whately on, 82–4, 111. *See also* Evangelicalism *supra*.
Rome, earlier attitude to, 75; writings hostile to, 133, 134, 139, 140
Secession, 6 $n^1$, 124, 125, 138 *and* $n^2$, 174, 179

Sermons of. *For individual sermons see under heading* Sermons

Newman, John Henry—*cont.*
*Parochial and Plain Sermons*, 25, 136, 190 *nn*, 192 *and n*, 211 *et seq. passim*; 261 *et seq. passim*; 281–93 *nn passim*, 296 *n*, 302 $n^2$, 305 *n*, 308 $n^5$, 310, 318, 322–8 *nn passim*
*Sermons on Subjects of the Day*, 110 *n*, 166 $n^1$, 168, 169, 170, 259, 328 *n*.[1]
*University Sermons* 236 $n^3$, 290

Writings of:
*Apologia pro Vita Sua*, 106, 109 *n*, 335; *quoted* on relation of Keble's thoughts to Butler's philosophy, 72 *n*, 232; *quoted*, 33, 107 $n^3$, 167, 169, 173 $n^1$; *cited*, 97, 170 *and nn*, 199, 232, 254 *nn*, 255 *et passim*.
*Arians, The, in the Fourth Century*, 115–16
*Callista*, 117
*Certain Difficulties felt by Anglicans, etc.*, 166 *and* $n^1$, 183 $n^3$, 335 $n^3$
*Church, The, of the Fathers*, 117, 135
*Development of Christian Doctrine*, 173, 199, 334 $n^3$
*Essays, Critical and Historical*, 41 $n^2$, 62 *n*, 63 *n*, 146 *n*, 333 *nn*
*Grammar of Assent*, 236 $n^3$, 290
'Lead, Kindly Light,' 107
*Lectures on Justification*, 140, 280, 282–94 *and nn passim*
*Lectures on the Prophetical Office of the Church*, 55 $n^1$, 132 $n^2$, 139, 193 $n^1$, 195–9; conception of tradition in, 198–9
*Loss and Gain*, 116 $n^3$, 246, 335 *and* $n^2$
*On the Catholicity of the English Church*, 149
*Prospects, The, of the Anglican Church*, 41 *and* $n^2$, 62, 63, 146, 333
*Restoration, The, of Suffragan Bishops Recommended, etc.*, 11
*Retractation of Anti-Catholic Statements*, 140 $n^2$, 171 *and* $n^3$
*Tracts for the Times*, 102, 129–34, 145; contributions to, 137, 188–9 *and nn*, 190 $n^4$, 191 $n^1$, 193 *and* $n^1$, 194, 232 $n^3$
*Tract XC*, 157, 163, 177, 178, 290 $n^1$; explanation of, in letter to Rev. R. W. Jelf, D.D., 157; letter to Bishop of Oxford expressing loyalty to Church of England, 158 *and* $n^1$
Newman, John Henry—*cont.*
'True Elect, The,' poem, 210, 259 $n^1$
'Twelve Lectures addressed to the Anglican Party of 1833,' 335 *and* $n^3$
*Via Media, The, of the Anglican Church*, 11 $n^2$, 132 *and* $n^3$, 140 *and* $n^2$, 152 $n^3$, 193–9 *nn passim*, 290 $n^1$

*Letters and Correspondence of*, 108 *n*, 125 $n^2$, 148 *nn*, 246 $n^2$

*Correspondence of, with John Keble and others*, 108 *n*, 247 $n^1$, 254 $n^4$

*Letters* to F. Rogers, *quoted*, 148 *and* $n^2$

Richmond's drawing of, 105 *and* $n^2$

Otherwise mentioned, 14, 21, 25, 29, 39, 43, 47, 54, 58, 71, 78, 81, 86, 92, 95, 100 $n^1$, 141 $n^1$, 144, 176, 177 $n^1$, 246, 263

Newman, F. W. Reminiscences, *quoted*, 332 *and* $n^3$
Newton, John, 32–3, 36, 75
Niebuhr, 87
Noetics, the, 77 *et seq.*, 182
Non-Jurors, the, 17–19, 21, 134 $n^5$
view of the Eucharist, 18 *and* $n^1$, 316
Norris, H. H., 26
Nott, G. F., Bampton Lectures of, *cited*, 224 $n^4$
Nouet, 297
Novalis, 57

Oakeley, F., 149 *and* $n^4$, 151, 165 $n^3$, 178
*Historical Notes on the Tractarian Movement*, 125 $n^2$, 217 $n^3$, 335–6
O'Brien's *An Attempt to Explain the Doctrine of Justification, etc.*, 280
O'Connell, 98
Ollard, Canon, 213 $n^1$, 334 $n^1$
*Short History of the Oxford Movement*, 6 $n^1$, 97, 332 $n^1$, 337
Oriel College, 77, 104, 105 $n^2$
Oscott Seminary, 57, 147 $n^3$
Overton, J. H.
*Anglican Revival, The*, 337
*English Church in the Nineteenth Century, The*, 9, 11, 13, 25 *nn*, 41 $n^1$
*Non-Jurors, The*, 17 $n^1$, 18 $n^1$

Oxford, 103–4
Evangelicalism and, 39
Martyrs' Memorial, 144
Movements of religious reformation associated with, 29
Oxford Movement, the, 184, 211, 225; defined, 6 *and* $n^1$; Evangelical condemnation of, 43; connection of, with Evangelicalism, 43, 211, 311; forerunners of, 45; as a phase of the Romantic movement, 56 *et seq.*; Newman's influence in, 108; sketch of the events of, 127 *et seq.*; static and progressive elements in, 127–8; effect of, on the revival of patristic study in England, 141; effect of, on the old Anglican conception of the Church, 202, 203 *and* $n^1$, 206
*See also under headings* Neo-Anglicanism, Tractarian, Tractarian piety, etc.
Oxford University, 95, 142–3
Hebdomadal Board, 177
Subscription and degrees, question of, 142–3

Palmer, W. (of Magdalen), 334 $n^3$, and the Jerusalem Bishopric, 163
Palmer, W. (of Worcester), 334 *and* $n^3$
Contribution to *Tracts*, 132, 188 $n^2$
defence of *Tract XC*, 156, 159
Eucharist, doctrine of, in, 317
Hadleigh meeting, plan of an Association, 128, 129 *and* $n^1$
*Narrative, A, of Events, etc.*, 6–7, 176, 334–5, 336
*Origines Liturgicae*, 334
*Quoted* on Bishop Jebb, 332
*Remarks on Dr. Arnold's Principles of Church Reform*, 334 $n^3$
*Treatise on the Church of Christ*, 185 $n^2$, 199–202 *and nn*, 203 *and* $n^2$, 231 $n^3$, 334 $n^3$
Palmerston, Lord, 162
Pantheism, 299, 300
Paris, Matthew, 58
Parliamentary Reform, 204
Pattison, Mark, 21 $n^1$, 78, 167, 168 *and* $n^1$, 231 $n^6$
*Memoir, cited*, 82, 167, 168 *and* $n^1$
'Peculiars,' 149
Peel, Sir Robert, 95, 99 *and* $n^1$
Pelagianism, accusation of, 242, 275, 278, 342 $n^1$
Penance, 311, 312 $n^2$
Penitence, 311 *and* $n^2$
Perceval, A. P., 128, 133, 134 *and* $n^1$, 162
*A Collection of Papers connected with the Theological Movement of* 1833, 129 $n^2$, 133–4, 184 *nn*
Contributions to *Tracts*, 133
Peter the Great, 18 $n^2$
Pfleiderer, O., *Die Entwicklung der protestantischen Theologie*, 340
Phillpotts, Bishop, of Exeter, 182
*Plain Sermons by Contributors to the 'Tracts for the Times,'* 191 $n^2$, 212, 213 *and* $n^1$, 229 $n^3$, 268 $n^1$
Plato, 297
Pluralism, 12, 13, 14, 15
Porteus, B., Bishop of London, 36–7
Pragmatism, 236 $n^3$, 237, 269
Prayer Book, First, of Edward VI., 17
1662, revision of, 48
Predestination, idea of, 252–3, 255, 257; and the longing for holiness, 260
Pre-Raphaelite Art, 206
Prevost, Sir George, 213 $n^1$, 336 n$^1$
Probability, principle of, 189 *and* $n^2$
Prophetical Tradition, the, of Newman, 198
Protestant Churches and the succession, 194–5
Protestantism, Newman *cited*, on, 41
Pugin, 57, 151 $n^1$
Purcell, S., *Life of Cardinal Manning*, 138 $n^1$, 339
Puritan conception of the Church, 95 *and n*
Puritans, 2
*Puseyism*, the word, 132, 332
Pusey, Edward Bouverie, 124–6, 136–7, 174–5
Anglican 'Sisters of Mercy,' idea of instituting, 166 *and* $n^3$, 246, 247
Atonement: Protestant doctrine of, on, 298 $n^3$
Catholic devotional literature: work for, 174–5
Characteristics of, 125; yearning for holiness, 126; Newman's picture of, 125 $n^2$
Cross theology (Evangelical and pietistic) in, 242–4, 249–51, 252 *n*, 297, 298, 300
Evangelicalism, attitude to, 125 $n^2$, 297; view of Wesleyanism, 298 $n^1$. *See* Cross theology *supra*
Heresy suit against, 165, 174, 318
Jerusalem Bishopric, attitude to the, 162, 164 $n^2$

Pusey, Edward Bouverie—*cont.*
Justification, views on, 289 *n*, 293 $n^2$, 294 $n^1$
Martyrs' Memorial, attitude to, 144
Newman, intimacy with, 125, 126; view of Newman's attitude to doctrine of Purgatory, 140 *and* $n^1$
Pantheism, view of, 299–300
Patristic studies of, 250, 296–7
Religious development: mystical vein in, 242, 245, 296 *et seq.*, 313; German pietism, influence of, on, 125 $n^2$, 249 *and* $n^3$; influence of St. Augustine, on, 243, 250, 251 *and* $n^1$
Rome: attitude to reunion with, 151 $n^2$
Tractarian Movement: participation in, 136–7; influence in, 125, 128, 136–7; in the last years of, 174–5
Wesleyanism, view of, 298 $n^1$

Sermons of, 212 *and* $n^3$, 221; characteristics in, 250, 296. *For individual sermons see under heading* Sermons

Holy Eucharist, the, a Comfort to the Penitent (the condemned sermon), 165 *et seq.*, 318, 319–22
*Plain Sermons, etc.*, in, 236 $n^1$, 252 *n*, 259 *n*, 308 $n^2$, 320 $n^2$
*Sermons during the Season from Advent to Whitsuntide*, 212 $n^3$, 216 $n^2$, 221, 227, 228, 235, 242, 243, 247, 250, 257, 297, 299–305 *nn passim*, 322, 327 *n*, 328; preface to, 299
*Sermons preached in St. Saviour's, Leeds*, in, 243, 251 $n^4$, 252 *n*, 297 *nn*, 302–4 *nn*, 319 $n^1$, 320 *nn*.

Writings:
Catena Patrum, the, 137, 152
*Historical Inquiry into the Theology of Germany*, 27–8
*Letter to Richard, Lord Bishop of Oxford*, 198 $n^1$
*Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury, etc.* (1842), 164 $n^2$
Library of the Fathers, 141 *and* $n^2$
*Scriptural Views of Holy Baptism*, 308 *and* $n^4$, 309 *et seq.*
*Tracts for the Times:* contributions to, 130 $n^1$, 132, 244–5, 308 *and* $n^4$; attitude in defence of Tract XC., 156, 160 *and* $n^1$

Pusey, Edward Bouverie—*cont.*
Newman *quoted* on, 125 $n^2$, 136–7
Otherwise mentioned, 25-6, 27–8, 60, 82 $n^1$, 95, 136, 138 $n^2$, 149, 158, 176, 213 *and* $n^1$, 231, 331, 332

Pusey, Lucy, 247

Radicalism, 93, 94
Rationalism, 300
Real Presence, the, 315, 317
*Records of the Church*, 201 $n^2$
Reform Bill, the, 96–7, 99
Reform movement, 94 *et seq.*
Reformation, the: bias of the Oxford leaders in estimate of, 31
Reformation, English, the, 1–2, 197, 244–5; preservation of continuity in, 181
Reformation, Martyrdom of Bishops, 180 *and* $n^2$
*Reminiscences of Forty Years, by an Hereditary High Churchman*, 22 *and n*
Renan, 174
Reverence in worship, 323
Rickards, S., 115 $n^1$
Ridley, 1, 50 $n^2$, 55, 316
Rigg, J. H., *Oxford High Anglicanism*, 338
Ritschl, A., on Catholic and Evangelical conception of Justification, 274
Ritschl, O., *Dogmengeschichte, cited* 197 $n^5$, 275, 276 *nn*
Ritualism, 149 $n^4$, 151 *and* $n^1$, 325–6, 338, 340
Rogers, F. *See* Blachford, Lord
Romaine, William, 32
pamphlets by, 32 *and* $n^3$
Roman Catholic Modernism, 173
Romanism, attraction of, 128
Romanticism, 56 *et seq.*, 116, 219, 307
Romantic temper a factor in the Oxford Movement, 323
Rome, reunion with: Alexander Knox on, 49 *and* $n^1$; attitude of Pusey to, 151 $n^2$
Rome, secessions to, 43, 44, 178, 179 *and* $n^1$, 334 $n^3$
Rose, Hugh James, 27–8, 115, 128, 135, 331, 332, 334
Rousseau, 57, 120
Routh, Dr., 151 $n^1$
Russell, Lord, 98 $n^4$
Russian Church, the, 18 $n^2$
Ruysbroek, 297

Sacramentarians, 30
St. Augustine, 31, 222, 250, 251 $n^1$, 252, 275, 276, 283 *and* $n^2$, 284 $n^1$, 293, 296, 301 $n^2$
dependence of the Oxford Movement on, 250, 260–1
St. Bernard, 249, 297, 301 $n^2$
St. Chrysostom, 31
St. John, Ambrose, 178
St. John of the Cross, 297
St. Saviour's, Leeds, 213; *A Course of Sermons* preached in, 213
St. Theresa, 297
Sancroft, Archbishop, 17
Saravia, *cited*, 183
Sarolea, *Cardinal Newman*, 109 *n*, *cited*, 173 $n^4$
Schlegel, 57
Scott, Thomas, 33, 34
Scott, Sir Walter, 58–62, 73, 158, 333
Keble's essay on, 60–62
Waverley Novels, the, 22, 58–61, 206
Scottish Free Kirk, secession of, 203
Scupoli, 297
*The Spiritual Combat, etc.*, 297 $n^5$
Secessions to Rome, 43, 44, 178, 179 *and* $n^1$, 334 $n^3$
Secular zeal for reform, 14, 15

Sermons *cited or quoted*:

Froude, Richard Hurrell

'Duty, the, of Aiming at the Highest Excellence,' 240 $n^2$
'Innocence of Children the Highest Moral Condition,' 241 $n^2$
'Knowledge of Duty attainable only by Practising,' 239
'Path, the, of Duty not difficult to Faith,' 239 $n^1$
'Religious Uses of Industry,' 239 $n^2$
'Repentance not equivalent in this Life to Innocence,' 241 $n^1$

Keble, John

'Christ Uprising,' 289 *n*
'Christian Good Night, the,' 289 *n*
'Hell,' 217 $n^2$
'Last Judgment, the,' 217 $n^2$
'On the Death of a King,' 203 $n^3$
'Our Primitive Tradition, recognised in Holy Scripture,' 190 $n^4$

Manning, Henry Edward

'Fasting a Means to Christian Perfection,' 246 $n^1$
'Sealing, the, of the Elect,' 262–3
'Spiritual Cross, the,' 251 $n^2$
'Waiting, the, of the Invisible Church,' 263

Newman, John Henry

'Attendance on Holy Communion,' 325
'Call, the, of David,' 227
'Chastisement amid Mercy,' 255 $n^1$
'Christ hidden from the World,' 227 $n^6$
'Christ manifested in Remembrance,' 209 *and nn*
'Christ's Privations: a Meditation for Christians,' 249 $n^1$
'Christian Ministry, the,' 192 *n*
'Christian Mysteries, the,' 219
'Christian Sympathy,' 223 $n^4$
'Communion of Saints, the,' 264, 267
'Contrast between Truth and Falsehood in the Church,' 253 $n^1$
'Crucifixion, the,' 235
'Difficulty of Realising Sacred Privileges,' 238
'Divine Call,' 227
'Equanimity,' 258 $n^4$
'Eucharistic Presence, the,' 318
'Faith without Demonstration,' 219
'Faith without Sight,' 218
'Fasting a Source of Trial,' 249 $n^2$
'Fellowship, the, of the Apostles,' 192 *n*, 267 $n^2$
'Gift, the, of the Spirit,' 310 $n^1$, 323 *n*
'Good Part of Mary, the,' 323
'Gospel, the, a Trust committed to us,' 190 $n^4$
'Gospel Feast, the,' 318
'Gospel Palaces, the,' 324 $n^4$
'Gospel Sign, the,' addressed to Faith,' 219
'Gospel Witnesses, the,' 190 $n^4$, 217
'Greatness, the, and Littleness of Human Life,' 215 $n^1$, 233
'Holiness Necessary for Future Blessedness,' 230, 233
'Humiliation, the, of the Eternal Son,' 221
'Ignorance of Evil,' 238
'Immortality, the, of the Soul,' 216 *and* $n^3$, 225–6
'Incarnate Son, the, a Sufferer and a Sacrifice,' 221–2
'Individuality, the, of the Soul,' 225–6
'Indulgence in Religious Privileges,' 259 $n^1$
'Infant Baptism,' 217, 308 $n^5$
'Intermediate State, the,' 117 *n*, 218
'Invisible World, the,' 215

NEWMAN, JOHN HENRY—*cont.*

'Inward Witness to the Truth of the Gospel,' 235
'Judaism of the Present Day,' 284 *n*[2]
'Keeping Fast and Festival,' 258 *n*[4]
'Law, the, of the Spirit,' 285 *n*[1]
'Love of Religion, a New Life,' 233
'Love the One Thing Needful,' 248 *n*[2], 249 *n*[1]
'Many called, Few chosen,' 255 *n*[1], 256
'Moral Consequences of Single Sins,' 237
'Moral Effects of Communion with God,' 237 *n*[2]
'Mysteries in Religion,' 216, 296 *n*
'Mystery, the, of the Holy Trinity,' 219
'Offerings for the Sanctuary,' 325
'Outward and Inward Notes of the Church,' 166 *n*[1]
'Particular Providence, a, as revealed in the Gospel,' 227
'Parting, the, of Friends,' 172 *and n*[1]
'Peace and Joy amid Chastisement,' 293 *n*[1]
'Peace in Believing,' 220
'Power, the, of the Will,' 238 *n*[3]
'Present Blessings,' 259 *n*[1], 326 *n*[1]
'Regenerating Baptism,' 308 *n*[5]
'Religion Pleasant to the Religious,' 234
'Religious Faith Rational,' 235
'Reverence a Belief in God's Presence,' 324 *n*[1]
'Reverence in Worship,' 323
'Righteousness not of Us, but in Us,' 286 *n*[2], 293 *n*[2]
'Rising with Christ,' 248 *n*[4], 253 *n*[4]
'Saving Knowledge,' 236
'Self-Contemplation,' 292 *n*[2]
'Self-Denial, the Test of Religious Earnestness,' 255–6
'Shrinking from Christ's Coming,' 322 *n*[2]
'State of Innocence, the,' 237
'Strictness, the, of the Law of Christ,' 281 *n*[2]
'Sudden Conversions,' 229 *n*[3]
'Temporal Advantages,' 243 *n*[3]
'Tolerance of Religious Error,' 258 *n*[2]
'Use of Saints' Days,' 232
'Ventures of Faith,' 219 *n*[3], 293 *n*[1]

NEWMAN, JOHN HENRY—*cont.*

'Visible Church, the, an Encouragement to Faith,' 192 *and n*
'Visible Church, the, for the Sake of the Elect,' 261 *n*
'Visible Temple, the,' 257 *n*, 267 *n*[1], 325, 328 *n*[1]
'Waiting for Christ,' 324 *n*[2]
'Warfare the Condition of Victory,' 218
'Watching,' 228
'Worship, a Preparation for Christ's Coming,' 324
'Yoke, the, of Christ,' 247, 253 *n*[2]

PUSEY, EDWARD BOUVERIE

'Bliss of Heaven, We shall be like Him,' 302
'Bliss of Heaven, We shall see Him as He is,' 297 *n*[1], 302
'Christian, the, the Temple of God,' 303 *n*[7]
'Christian's Life, the, in Christ,' 303 *n*[2], 319 *n*[1]
'Conversion,' 229 *n*[3]
'End, the, of All Things,' 217 *n*[2]
'Glory, the, of the Body,' 319 *n*[1]
'God's Glories in Infants, set forth in the Holy Innocents,' 308 *n*[2]
'God's Presence in Loneliness,' 301 *n*[3]
'Heaven the Christian's Home,' 319 *n*[1], 321 *n*[4]
'Holiness' (first sermon), 231
'Holy Eucharist, the, a Comfort to the Penitent,' 318–22
'Incarnation, the, a Lesson of Humility,' 221 *n*[3], 250 *n*[2]
'Increased Communions,' 322 *n*[2], 327 *n*[1]
'Irreversible Chastisements,' 244 *n*
'Joy out of Suffering,' 243 *n*[4]
'Looking unto Jesus the Groundwork of Penitence,' 298
'Loving Penitence,' 319 *n*[1], 320 *n*[2]
'Obedience the Condition of Knowing,' 236 *n*[1]
'Our Risen Lord's Love for Penitents,' 222 *n*[5]
'Transfiguration, the, the Earnest of the Christian's Glory,' 320 *n*[2]
'Will of God, the, the Cure of Self-Will,' 297 *n*[3], 301 *n*[2]

Shairp, Professor J. C., estimate of Keble's religious poetry, 71 *n*[3]; *quoted*, 73–74

Sharp, Archbishop, 39
Shelley, 68
Sikes, Thomas, 26 *and* $n^2$
Simeon, Charles, 26, 38–9, 40
Simeon Trust, the, 39
Smith, James Hicks, 22 *n*, 58
Social reform, period of, 93 *et seq.*
Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 25
Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, 38
Socinianism, 300
Söderblom, *Religions Problemet*, 109 *n*, 173 *nn*
Southey, 62–3, 69
  view of the Church in the time before 1833, 9–10
Spangenberg, 30
Spencer, G. A., 151 $n^2$
Squarson, the, 8, 9
Stanley, A. P., 73, 88, 92, 139
State Church, the problem of, 202 *et seq.*
Static view of the Church, 180 *et seq.*, 199, 201 $n^2$, 202, 257
Stephen, Sir James, 144 $n^1$
Stephens, W. R. W., *Life and Letters of W. F. Hook*, 337 $n^1$
Stewart, H. L., 'The Place of Coleridge in English Theology,' 67 *and* $n^2$
Stoel, H., *Kardinaal Newman, cited*, 109 *n*, 282 *n*
Stokes, Professor, G. T., 'Alexander Knox and the Oxford Movement,' 331–2
Stolberg, 57
Stone, Dr. Darwell, 213 $n^1$
  *A History of the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist*, 314 $n^1$, 315–7 *nn*
Storr, *Development of English Theology*, 41 *n*, 211 *and* $n^1$, 306 $n^4$, *et passim*
Sufic poetry, 300
Sumner, Charles Richard, 37
Sumner, John Bird, Archbishop of Canterbury, 37, 307
  *Treatise on Apostolical Preaching*, 80, 307
Surin, Jean-Joseph, 175 $n^2$
  *Fondements de la vie spirituelle*, 175 $n^2$, 297; Pusey's preface to, 250 $n^1$, 297–8 *and nn*
Swedish literature on the Tractarian and High Church movements, 2 $n^1$, 109 *n*, 341–2
Swedish Lutheran Church, 201 $n^1$
Symons, Dr. (Vice-Chancellor of Oxford), 165, 177
Syncretists, The, 197

Tait, Archbishop, 151, 152 $n^1$, 156
Tauler, 297, 321 $n^2$
Taylor, Jeremy, 231, 246
  Eucharist, doctrine of, in 315–16,
  Justification, on, 277–8
  Pelagian tendency in, 278
  Personal sanctification, on, 231, 277
Teignmouth, Lord, 38
Tertullian, 296, 312 $n^2$
Test and Corporation Acts, 4, 94, 95, 204
Thackeray, *cited*, 37
Thirlwall, Connop, 92
Thornton, Henry, 37, 38
Thureau-Dangin, *La Renaissance Catholique*, 6 $n^1$, 339, 340 *and* $n^1$
Toplady, 243
Towns, effect of growth of, 12
Tractarian conception of the time before 1833, 6–15; appreciation of the Reformers, 188; view of Roman Catholics, 185 $n^1$; view of the State Church, 202–6; view of Church discipline and excommunication, 205 $n^5$. *See also under* Oxford Movement
Tractarian piety, 192, 211 *et seq.*, 242, 311
  Apocalyptic note in, 228
  Conversion, preaching of, in, 228–9
  Cross, the: theology of, in, 249 *et seq.*
  Doctrine, the mysteriousness of, in, 219
  Eschatology, in, 217, 226–7 *and* $n^2$
  Forgiveness of Sins, 321 $n^2$
  Holiness, ideal of, in, 230 *et seq.*
  Incarnation, doctrine of, in, 220–2, 250
  Obedience, motive of, in, 230
  Preaching, ascetic motive in, 247 *et seq.*
  Religious discipline, in, 244 *et seq.*
  Revelation, character of, 219
  Sacramental mysticism in, 224
  Sacramentalism in, 322 *et seq.*, 331
    developments from, 322 *et seq.*
  Spiritual reality in, 214–17
  Tradition and Primitive Antiquity in, 219
  Trinity, the doctrine of, in, 219–20
  Truth, the care of, 217
Tractarian school: distinguishing habit, 107 *and* $n^1$
Tractarianism, connection with Evangelicalism, 43, 211, 311
*Tracts for the Times*, 6 $n^1$, 22, 23, 79, 102, 130 *n*, 136, 137, 139–41, 152, 181 $n^2$, 203, 306, 333; changed character of, after

Pusey's adhesion, 137; signs of divergence between Newman and Pusey in, 140; censured by Bishop Bagot, 144–5; seeds of development of right of self-determination of the Church, in, 203

Apostolical succession, in, 181, 185–9, 191, 202

Motto of, 130 *n*

Piety, characterisation of, in, 213

Rome, hostility to, in the Tracts, 187, 188 *and* $n^1$

Tract XC., 152 *and* $n^3$, 153–5, 168; a forerunner to this Tract, 154 $n^1$; letter of the Four Tutors on, 156 *and nn*

*See also under names of contributors to the Tracts*

Tradition, Primitive, 195, 197–8, 219
Newman on limits of antiquity in, 197–8
Transubstantiation, 315, 316, 318
Tulloch, J., *Movements of Religious Thought*, 82 $n^3$
Turner, C. H., *Apostolic Succession, cited*, 186 *and* $n^1$

Utilitarianism, 93

Van Mildert, Bishop, 24–5, 181 $n^2$
Bampton Lectures of, 24
Vaughan, Henry, 70
Venn, Henry, 37
Venn, John, 37, 38, 39
*Via Media*, 47–9, 54, 55, 138, 195
Characteristic feature of, 257
Golden age of, the, 127
Mannerisms in, 138–9
Oxford University attitude to, 164
Vincent of Lérins' *Commonitorium, cited*, 23 *and* $n^3$
von Hügel, F., on 'Mysticism and Pantheism,' *cited*, 299

Wade, John, 13
Wakeling G., *The Oxford Movement*, 337
Walsh, W., *The Secret History of the Oxford Movement*, 338; *History of the Romeward Movement*, 338
Warburton, Bishop
*Alliance between Church and State*, 65, 84
*Doctrine of Grace, cited*, 19 $n^1$
Ward, Wilfrid
*Last Lectures*, 108 *n*, 236 $n^3$
*Life and Times of Cardinal Wiseman*, 147 $n^3$
*Life of John Henry Newman*, 108 *and n*, 212 $n^1$
*W. G. Ward and the Catholic Revival*, 178 $n^1$, 339 $n^2$
*W. G. Ward and the Oxford Movement*, 149 *nn et seq. passim*; 236 $n^3$, 268 $n^3$, 281 $n^3$, 335 $n^1$, 339
Ward, W. G., 139, 149 *and* $n^3$, 150–1, 152 *and* $n^1$, 165 $n^3$, 175–8, 335 *and* $n^1$
Articles in the *British Critic*, 175–6
Conception of the Church, 269–72
*Ideal, The, of a Christian Church*, 176–8, 236 $n^3$, 268 *and* $n^3$, 269–73, 280 *and nn*, 281–2, 292
Newman's influence on, 151
Preference for Rome, 272
Reply to Palmer, 176
Social passion in, 271
Tract XC., and, 152 $n^1$, 157 *and* $n^3$
Waterland, Daniel, 279 *and* $n^2$, 316
*A Summary View of the Doctrine of Justification*, 279
*Regeneration Stated and Explained*, 306 *and* $n^3$
*The Use and Value of Ecclesiastical Antiquity*, 197 $n^7$
Watson, Dr. E. W., *cited*, 133
Watson, Joshua, 12, 25–6
Watson, Richard, Bishop of Llandaff, 13
Waverley Novels, the, 22, 58–61, 206
Weaver, R., *A Complete View of Puseyism*, 294 $n^2$
Wellington, Duke of, 95, 99
Wesley brothers, the, 7
Sacramental view of the Eucharist in hymns of, 316
Wesley, John, 29–31, 46
Influence of Law's ideal of holiness on, 19, 230
Influence of, on Neo-Anglicanism, 331
Letters to Alex. Knox, 46
Newman, *quoted* on, 34
On Justification, 279 *and* $n^3$
mentioned, 26 $n^2$, 32, 43, 332
Westminster Catechism, 315 $n^7$
*Westminster Review*, the, 93
Whately, Richard, 78, 82–6, 88, 91, 95, 111, 143, 182, 202
*Letters on the Church, by an Episcopalian*, 84–6

White, J. Blanco, 81, 82 *and* $n^2$, 121
Whitefield, 7, 9, 34, 43, 46
Wilberforce brothers, the, 43, 44
Wilberforce, H. W., 332–3
Wilberforce, Robert Isaac, 43, 44, 71, 82 $n^1$, 122 $n^3$, 136 *and* $n^1$, 141 $n^1$
Wilberforce, William, 37 *and* $n^2$, 38, 39, 45, 136 *and* $n^1$
*Practical View of the Prevailing Religious System*, 37 $n^2$
Williams, Isaac, 136 *and* $n^3$, 160, 251 $n^4$, 336; candidature of the Chair of Poetry, 160, 161 *and* $n^1$
*Autobiography of*, 132 $n^1$, 213 $n^1$, 336
*On Reserve in Communicating Religious Knowledge*, 137 *and* $n^2$, 143, 152, 160, 258 $n^3$
Paris Breviary, hymns from, 136 $n^3$, 160 $n^5$
*Plain Sermons by Contributors to the 'Tracts for the Times,'* 213 *and* $n^1$, 268 $n^1$
Poetry of, 136 $n^3$, 160, 206–8 *and nn*; contributions to *Lyra Apostolica*, 141 $n^1$, 160; poems, *cited or quoted*, 160, 180, 207, 229
Sermon: 'Virtue of the Cross through Love,' 251 *and* $n^4$, 252
Williams, Isaac—*cont.*
*Tracts for the Times*: contributions to, 152. *See* On Reserve *above*.
otherwise mentioned, 71, 76
Wilson, H. B., 156 $n^1$
Wilson, R. F., 213 $n^1$
Wilson, Thomas (Bishop of Sodor and Man), 5, 17 $n^2$, 134 *and* $n^4$, 205 *and* $n^4$, 231 $n^4$
*Catechetical Instruction for Candidates for Holy Orders*, 278
Justification on, 278–9
*Meditations on his Sacred Office*, 134
*Sacra Privata*, 17 $n^2$
Wiseman, Cardinal, 147 *and* $n^3$
Article in *Dublin Review* on the Donatists, 147, 148 $n^2$, 170 $n^3$
Influence on Newman, 147
mentioned, 121, 140, 149, 160, 334 $n^3$
Wordsworth, Christopher, 26
*Theophilus Anglicanus*, 201 $n^2$
Wordsworth, William, 10, 63, 68, 69–71, 72, 73, 76, 295, 301, 317
World Conference on *Faith and Order*, *cited*, 198 $n^3$
Wycliffe, 29

ZINZENDORFF, Count, 19 $n^1$
Zwingli, 309

*Printed in England at* THE BALLANTYNE PRESS
SPOTTISWOODE, BALLANTYNE & CO. LTD.
*Colchester, London & Eton*

DATE DUE

JUN 0 4 2011

THE KING'S LIBRARY
3000091975

C0-ALI-651